

BRILL'S COMPANION TO
GREEK
AND LATIN
PASTORAL



Edited by
Marco Fantuzzi &
Theodore Papanghelis

BRILL

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

BRILL'S COMPANION TO GREEK AND LATIN PASTORAL

BRILL'S COMPANION TO GREEK AND LATIN PASTORAL

EDITED BY

MARCO FANTUZZI AND THEODORE PAPANGHELIS



BRILL
LEIDEN • BOSTON
2006

Cover illustration: Roman farmers with sheep. Fragment of a wall painting.
Creator: Unknown. Code: 0390002019. Source: Ann Roman Picture Library.
© Ann Roman Picture Library/Heritage-Images.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A C.I.P. record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN-13: 978 90 04 14795 9

ISBN-10: 90 04 14795 0

© Copyright 2006 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill Academic Publishers,
Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

*All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic,
mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written
permission from the publisher.*

*Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal
use is granted by Brill provided that
the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright
Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910
Danvers MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change*

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Editors' Introduction	vii
Contributors	xix
Abbreviations	xxv
 K. GUTZWILLER, The Herdsman in Greek Thought.....	1
B. ACOSTA-HUGHES, Bucolic Singers of the Short Song: Lyric and Elegiac Resonances in Theocritus' Bucolic <i>Idylls</i>	25
R. PRETAGOSTINI, How Bucolic are Theocritus' Bucolic Singers? ...	53
C.A. FARAONE, Magic, Medicine and Eros in the Prologue to Theocritus' <i>Id.</i> 11	75
S.A. STEPHENS, Ptolemaic Pastoral	91
N. KREVANS, Is There Urban Pastoral? The Case of Theocritus, <i>Id.</i> 15	119
A. SENS, Epigram at the Margins of Pastoral	147
H. BERNSDORFF, The Idea of Bucolic in the Imitators of Theocritus, 3rd–1st century BC	167
J.D. REED, Continuity and Change in Greek Bucolic between Theocritus and Virgil	209
M. FANTUZZI, Theocritus' Constructive Interpreters, and the Creation of a Bucolic Reader	235
R. HUNTER, Virgil's <i>Ecl.</i> 1 and the Origins of Pastoral	263
P. HARDIE, Cultural and Historical Narratives in Virgil's <i>Eclogues</i> and Lucretius	275
R.R. NAUTA, Panegyric in Virgil's <i>Bucolics</i>	301
B.W. BREED, Time and Textuality in the Book of the <i>Eclogues</i>	333
T.D. PAPANGHELIS, Friends, Foes, Frames and Fragments: Textuality in Virgil's <i>Eclogues</i>	369
A. BARCHIESI, Music for Monsters: Ovid's <i>Metamorphoses</i> , Bucolic Evolution, and Bucolic Criticism.....	403
A. SCHIESARO, A Dream Shattered? Pastoral Anxieties in Senecan Drama	427
R. MAYER, Latin Pastoral after Virgil	451
E. MAGNELLI, Bucolic Tradition and Poetic Programme in Calpurnius Siculus	467
M. DI MARCO, The Pastoral Novel and the Bucolic Tradition	479

T.K. HUBBARD, Virgil, Longus, and the Pipes of Pan	499
B. HARRIES, The Drama of Pastoral in Nonnus and Colluthus	515
J.B. BURTON, The Pastoral in Byzantium	549
Bibliography	581
General Index	615
Index of Passages Discussed	629

EDITORS' INTRODUCTION

It is hard to think of pastoral without conjuring up a vision of idyllic landscape, idealized nature and musically idle shepherds. If this sounds very much like a layman's conception of what pastoral is about, it is also true that for quite a long time students and theoreticians of pastoral took idealized landscape and its denizens as the unquestionable constant that generated the tensions and polarities perceived at the heart of pastoral: Nature and Art, countryside and city, innocence and experience, childhood and maturity, contemplative *otium* and practical *negotium*. And whenever in modern times the philosophical contingent took up its position in the interpretative scheme (as when Thomas Rosenmeyer (1969) advanced Epicureanism as the main philosophical force animating pastoral), it was again in support of such implicit or explicit binary oppositions. However, considering such binary oppositions as the essential quality of pastoral is just part of a long history of attempts to define it, and the attempts are naturally contingent on the historical, ideological and aesthetic circumstances of those advancing the definitions.

Indeed, the definition of "pastoral" is a highly controversial issue in modern discussions which touch on the question of the generic identity of pastoral (often in contradistinction to bucolic), or endeavour to conceptualize it within a more sustainedly theoretical context.¹ This complex issue, while not addressed in its purest theoretical form, nevertheless informs many of the essays in this volume. Thus, while the scope of the collection as defined by the editors under the title "Greek and Latin Pastoral" precludes following some of the later paths taken by genre theorists, students and critics of pastoral in modern literature will find here much that will be methodologically as well as historically relevant to their concerns and purposes.

¹ It has been well remarked that "what is called 'Pastoral' in 1850 is not at first sight much like what is called 'Pastoral' in 1770"; and after all "a good deal of Pastoral—especially seventeenth-century Pastoral—is hardly at all an attempt to describe life in the English countryside, but is almost entirely preoccupied with the meaning of its own conventions": Barrell and Bull (1974) 7–8. Halperin's (1983a) chap. I.1 gives a full overview of the modern definitions (see also Rosenmeyer (1969), chap. 1). His study is still the most comprehensive analysis of the question of "pastoral" vs "bucolic".

As it happens, the purview and essence of βουκολιάζεσθαι and βουκολικός were already under negotiation between the 2nd and the 1st century BC. Moschus and Bion, for instance, who were the best known 'continuators' of Theocritus and formed with him the so-called bucolic triad, seem to have conceived of the type of poetry they were practising in more broad terms than typically bucolic settings and typically named herdsmen would imply: they offer no more than scattered hints at landscape description and only a handful of typically bucolic names, while they become increasingly concerned with erotic themes—themes handled in quite a different fashion than the reader of Theocritus' erotic bucolics might expect. More significantly perhaps, none of the characters known to us from their fragments (sometimes labelled βουκολικά by the testimonia) is given to the performance of bucolic contests, dialogues or songs. By contrast, just a few decades after Bion, Virgil in *Ecl.* 8 took care to strictly bucolicize the urban setting of his principal model, Theocritus' *Id.* 2; he even replaced the non-bucolic names of the main character's lover (Delphis) and of her assistant (Thestylis) in the Theocritean poem with properly bucolic ones (Daphnis and Amaryllis, respectively) in his own composition.

It was not only the question of the thematic contents and formal features of pastoral, and of their conformity with an emerging or notional generic pattern, that called forth differing responses from practitioners and critics in Antiquity and modern times alike. Equally important was the way pastoralists chose to represent their subject, and the principal concern here was about the relation in which the represented subject stood to what we might call the facts and realities on the bucolic ground. Being mainly concerned with humble characters in countryside settings, pastoral, unlike the higher genres, is apt to foster expectations of more or less unadulterated naturalism, and its representative modes are thus more likely to be held accountable for opening up a gap between 'reality' and its literary manipulation.

On such a realist-mimetic approach, Theocritus has been viewed as not only the originator of pastoral but also as its most genuine practitioner, with Virgil representing an idealizing imitation *cum* deviation from the norm established by the Greek poet. The expectation underlying this view is that pastoral should be simple and true to the rustic realities it sets out to depict. This is no realist aberration of times long gone but a commonly held view as recently as the late 19th century. In this scheme of things, Virgil, although heavily dependent on Theocritus, (unaccountably) departs from Theocritean mimesis not only by

allowing history and politics into the relative *hasychia* of his predecessor's bower but, more importantly, by smuggling into pastoral some kind of analogical mode that has the herdsmen and their milieu stand for something outside the simple rustic realities—hence the proliferation of allegory.

The idea that pastoral's only *raison d'être* consisted in its faithful reproduction of pure rustic life was never really called into question during the best part of the 19th century, and ultimately drew its force from a Romantic valorization of nature as purveyor of original truths. It is no surprise that this period, which made of Theocritus the unrepeatable paragon of genuine pastoral, also saw the fortunes of Virgil's 'imitative' and 'derivative' *Eclogues* sharply decline. Not long before the end of that century, however, an analogical sort of reading² was applied to Theocritus by Richard Reitzenstein (1893), whose concept of "bucolic masquerade" represented an attempt to assign the rustic and simple characters of Theocritus the function of 'masks' disguising some of the poet's learned contemporaries. Although a definite change of critical climate did not come about until early in the 20th century, Reitzenstein's analogical-allegorical challenge to mimeticism played its part in modifying the critical field long held by the latter.

This "mimetic-analogical split" has been related to Friedrich Schiller's seminal *On Naïve and Sentimental Poetry* (1795–1796) to which the analogical approach owes its principal intellectual premises,³ but it was Bruno Snell's essay of 1945, titled "The Discovery of Arcadia",⁴ that undertook a radical revaluation of Virgil's pastoral poetry as a construction of an imaginative landscape that, far from reflecting and failing reality, escapes it through art. Intensely reflexive, pastoral, on this view, negotiates the disjunction between reality and the ideal, and by confounding the realist creates a complex poetic world of internal consistency. Snell was building on, among other things, the idea of

² On mimetic *vs* analogical readings of bucolic poetry cf. Gutzwiller (1991): "a mimetic reader attributes what is said in the poem solely or primarily to the voice of the character, so that the reader's inability to integrate surface analogies into rationalized meaning is explained as the result of the character's naiveté. An analogical reading, on the other hand, reconstructs analogies to produce meaning. The analogical reader identifies the voice of the character closely with the voice of the poet, thus associating reconstructed meanings with authorial intention and often deemphasizing the gap between naïve and sophisticated levels of speaking" (p. 18).

³ Apart from Alpers (1979) 204–209, (1996) 28–37 and Halperin (1983a) 42–49, see Gutzwiller (1991), 194–199 and n. 64.

⁴ Engl. trans. in Snell (1953), 281–309 (= Hardie (ed.) (1999) vol. 1, 44–67).

man's gradual alienation from nature—a chronic discontent which, as well as throwing up a number of self-fulfilling polarities, is apt to make of nature the synecdochic catalyst for feelings of irrecoverable loss and intense nostalgia. Such feelings may be “[y]et a kind of immediacy, but an immediacy that is secondary because it incorporates the loss”.⁵ Loss of some kind of originary simplicity, the price to be paid for civilization and its attendant complexities, makes, then, for a ‘sentimental’, rather than ‘naive’, version of immediacy; and the all but paradoxical quality of such immediacy can only be sustained by reflexion, which a naive poet in his unproblematic and harmonious relationship to nature can arguably dispense with.

But hereabouts the naive is trumped by the sentimental, for the latter, albeit responding to actuality, is not limited by it, not only because, unlike the naive, it can exercise a choice as to how to represent actuality but also because it can harness it to the representation of a compensatory ideal world which has a stronger, if only imaginary, internal consistency and, thus, autonomy. Arcadia is such a world. Thus Snell's influential essay, even as it embraces the binary-oppositions principle, claims for pastoral space an autonomy which subsequent readers, less intent than Snell was on obviating the urgencies of the historical moment through belief in the Arcadian myth, were to emphasize more and more and for their own purposes.

Snell's autonomous Arcadia also marks a decisive move away from a generic approach to pastoral towards an emphasis on a representational mode which makes the *Eclogues* highly paradigmatic of all poetry that does not ‘qualify’ as naive; and the move was one to endear itself to modern critical consciousness. No longer a belated, and diluted, visitor to pastoral themes, Virgil was seen by some critics after Snell as the most accomplished representative of a literary type that was *naturaliter* reflexive and secondary, and as the creator of a semiotic space where pastoral themes were acquiring the mobility and versatility of signifiers. David Halperin's⁶ early 80s emphasis on the differential relation of bucolic poetry to traditional epos as the defining principle of Theocritus' poetic technique and manipulation of inherited themes, and Thomas Hubbard's⁷ late 90s claim that pastoral is about literary tradition and the negotiation of one's place within it (pastoral as “conven-

⁵ Gutzwiller (1991) 198.

⁶ Halperin (1983a).

⁷ Hubbard (1998).

tion" rather than as "theme", in his own disjunctive terms) represent just two of the most recent, and comprehensive, moves in that direction.

It may well be that it took what Stephen Hinds terms "[t]he late twentieth century aesthetic which privileges metaliterary self-consciousness as its master-term"⁸ to put pastoral's self-reflexive strain centre stage, but it is perhaps fair to say that the core pastoral texts, for all their formal differences and thematic peculiarities, make no secret of their preoccupation with issues of literary imitation, succession and inheritance, especially in their programmatic pronouncements. More importantly, pastoral has a knack of thematizing such issues in ways that are congenial to modern perspectives on tropes of allusivity and intertextuality. And once the critical pendulum swung in that direction, the dense textual artifice that came into full view was more likely than not to reveal the possibility of reversing, as it were, the trope and seeing pastoral discourse as just another, if distinguished, opportunity for the paramount play of literary consciousness.

It is, of course, no accident that the sea change took effect with Virgil's *Eclogues*, whose derivative status in relation to Theocritus, after being frowned upon, was affirmed and made a virtue of as the catalyst for a generic awareness that was only cautiously, and with many qualifications, granted (and sometimes denied) to Theocritus. But the latter's bucolic muse, now far removed from her 19th-cent. mimetic and realist advocates, also consented to have something of the shifting critical perceptions rub off on her. In particular, Theocritus' 'invention' or emphatic assumption of a tradition has already been under investigation; and once brought to the fore, this aspect of his work reveals gestures and processes of secondariness no less pronounced than those critics readily associate with Bion, ps.-Moschus' *Epitaph for Bion*, or Virgil's *Eclogues*. Those who find it hard to countenance the possibility of a 'weak' pastoral, or even consider it a contradiction in terms, will no doubt be interested to note how the Theocritean version has been gaining in 'strength'.⁹ It has further been shown how successfully Theocritus focused his efforts on creating an organic and coherent fictional

⁸ Hinds (1998) 90.

⁹ Berger (1984) 2, taking up a Bloomian distinction between "weak" and "strong", calls "strong pastoral" or "metapastoral" that which "[p]resents itself in the act of (mis)representing the pastoral that fathered it. Such pastoral constructs within itself an image of its generic traditions in order to criticize them and, in the process, performs a critique on the limits of its own enterprise even as it ironically displays its delight in the activity it criticizes. The great quantity of pastoral that does not do this may be

world for the characters and the settings of his poetry. His 'new' kind of hexameter poetry was meant as alternative to, and was bound to be measured against, epic and therefore had to construct for itself a unity which traditional epic could rely on myth to achieve. Surely, Theocritus' quest of internal consistency and his selective stylization are hardly evidence of a simple mimetic relation to rustic actuality; to become more aware of such strategies is to become more skeptical about a genuinely naturalist Theocritus; and this, in turn, works to blur clear-cut distinctions that inevitably showed Virgil up as an arm-chair pastoralist who only knew a shepherd when he read one. By transcending such rigid and usually unhelpful demarcations, the high level of critical attention directed at Theocritus and his immediate bucolic successors over the last three decades or so is bringing into sharper focus the continuities of the Greek and Latin pastoral tradition, against which the manifold subtleties of difference-in-sameness and sameness-in-difference can be evaluated more fully. Greek and Latin pastoral today is a richer and more unified subject than it used to be. It is certainly hoped that the present collection of essays bears out both of these points, but whereas 'unity' may still continue to be a matter for discussion, richness and extended scope are visibly confirmed by those essays that give evidence of classicists' vigorous interest in the fortunes of pastoral, beyond the 'canonical' authors and their immediate progeny, in imperial and post-imperial times.

Needless to say, we do not suggest that the bare outline given above is evidence of a critical sequence in which successive reading strategies and practices supersede one another in some kind of teleological progress. In practice, a shifting distribution of emphases is more visible than sharp turns and twists in critical discourses about ancient pastoral. Time-honoured questions and issues that can be traced back to old controversies are still alive and, of course, whenever pastoral as "theme" is at issue the familiar polarities will stage a comeback, however modified or "brought up to date" to accommodate our new critical master-terms. Perhaps, what this outline hints at is the possibility of evading the need for a definition of pastoral as genre by way of recounting the latest part of the history of criticism that has accumulated around literary types which by common, or almost common, consent we associate with the pastoral idea. As Paul Alpers might say, the best

classified as weak pastoral, and metapastoral poetry traditionally fashions as its target a generalized image of weak pastoral".

we can manage if pressed to give a generic definition would be something of a synecdoche or, to borrow the term he borrows from Kenneth Burke, a “representative anecdote”: “The history of pastoral criticism can be described as a series of representative anecdotes: Rapin’s Golden Age and Fontenelle’s innocent love; childhood and maturity in Schiller’s *On Naive and Sentimental Poetry*, and, in our own time, Poggioli’s pastorals of innocence and happiness and Empson’s social encounter of courtier and rustic”—or Alpers’s own “herdsmen and their lives, rather than landscape or idealized nature”.¹⁰ So the contributors to this volume might be thought of as offering, among other things, their own representative anecdote for pastoral—less grand than “Golden Age” or “innocent love”, perhaps, but keyed to some of the most familiar headings of our present critical discourses such as positioning within, and invention of, a generic tradition, or intertextual constitution of meaning and troping of metaliterary self-consciousness.

Whatever may have accrued to, or been subtracted from, pastoral over its long literary, artistic and cultural evolution, the figure of the shepherd, firmly established and hogging the picture or putting in a marginal appearance, is seldom absent or very far away. In her paper, Kathryn Gutzwiller charts the Greek literary-cultural traditions which make of the herdsman and his life a figure of multiple analogies and associations: emblematic of peace, order and harmony; a trope for the duties of a ruler; a reflection of what poets and philosophers do in the realm of thought. The anthropological and cultural background explored in her paper puts into perspective not only the practice of ancient bucolic’s pair of luminaries but that of its lesser lights as well. Post-Theocritean critical response was no less important for the history of the bucolic genre than the pre-Theocritean cultural/anthropological mould: Marco Fantuzzi shows how Theocritus’ ancient commentators were actively engaged in furthering the poet’s project of inventing/emphasizing a pre-existing tradition for bucolic poetry and of giving his new fictional world an internal coherence to match that of the literary worlds depicted by other more traditional genres—a process that often involves making explicit what is only implicit in Theocritus or foisting on him a crudely sensual conception of love in opposition to contemporary erotic poetry.

¹⁰ Alpers (1996) 13–28.

Benjamin Acosta-Hughes and Roberto Pretagostini explore some major aspects of Theocritus' own bucolic project: while also focusing on Theocritus' invention of a pastoral tradition, they illustrate his selective deployment of real-life 'precedents' enshrined in the sympotic tradition of short lyric/elegiac poems or in Sicilian folklore. Christopher Faraone takes a fresh look at the narrative frame of *Id.* 11 and re-evaluates Cyclops' *pharmakon* as a richly intertextual site and ironically programmatic point within a poetic tradition of protective incantations against the pains of love.

Richard Hunter sheds new light on the programmatic stance of *Ecl.* 1, arguing that the pastoral countryside as 'poetic construction' is made into a token of transference as the Meliboeus who loses his land to the 'barbarus miles' tropes the succession of Roman pastoral to Theocritean literary past. But if Virgil proved ready to receive Theocritus in Rome, he did so by streamlining the latter's centrifugal bucolicism into high generic visibility, thus establishing a norm which beckoned his own Latin successors not only to a reverential filing behind his coat-tails but also to gestures of playful and ironical reversal of prominent themes and values in a complex process of generic expansion and/or contraction and tentative re-definition. Roland Mayer offers an informative overview of the pastoral enterprise of Calpurnius Siculus, the *Einsiedeln Eclogues* poet and Nemesianus, whereas Enrico Magnelli zooms in on Calpurnius Siculus' relation to Virgil and highlights the subtleties of epigonal deference combined with a 'more-pastoral-than-thou attitude'.

Panegyric and the circumstances of patronage is the one constituent that comes into its own in Latin pastoral after Virgil. But the eulogistic strain, more often than not felt to jar with the 'true' spirit of pastoral, is traceable in both mainstays of ancient pastoral. Susan Stephens, widening the scope beyond Theocritus' strictly bucolic poems, draws attention to the dense mythical, allusive and intertextual network that relates ruler to landscape and allows the poet to denounce the miseries of Sicily and South Italy as a foil for the praise of Ptolemaic royalty. Ruurd Nauta, offering a comprehensive account of the panegyric dimension in the *Eclogues*, points to the various ways in which praise in the collection accommodates its stylistic and generic associations to the bucolic framework.

Intertextual dialogue is hardly a peculiarity of pastoral discourse: what is of peculiar significance is that such dialogue in pastoral is conspicuously instrumental in highlighting aspects of literary succession,

filiation and tradition formation. Exploring the intertextual modalities that convey such ideas, Thomas Hubbard taps *Daphnis and Chloe* and argues for Longus' thorough, but as a rule doubted, familiarity with, and redeployment of, some of the *Eclogues*' emblematic objects and figures as a means of framing relationships of discipleship and metaphors of continuity across different formal structures and literary types. Massimo Di Marco, as well as producing further literary evidence for *Daphnis and Chloe*'s intertextual dialogue with the *Eclogues*, explores the allusive ways in which the novel sets itself up as heir to a mainly Theocritean bucolic tradition, and singles out the erotic theme as testimony to Longus' departures from Theocritus' conception of love and, by extension, his poetics. Alexander Sens discusses patterns of intertextuality with pastoral in epigrams by Theocritus' contemporaries or near contemporaries, and shows how this literary form assumes the function of 'strong' pastoral and becomes a vehicle for self-reflexive comment and play with the conventions of pastoral poetry, by variously endorsing, debunking or misrepresenting its central values and conceits. But intertextual dialogue may also reveal patterns of intellectual and ideological negotiation on the largest possible scale, and in the first systematic charting of Lucretius' influence on Virgil's *Eclogues* Philip Hardie concentrates on the processes whereby *DRN*'s didactic modes and histories of socio-cultural change mould, at the level both of the individual and the collectivity, the pastoral world's poetic aetiologies and foundation myths as well as its perceptions of history and time.

Taking issue with conventional demarcations between bucolic and non-bucolic to trace patterns of continuity within the Theocritean corpus, and enquiring into the zone lying between Theocritus and Virgil, have both been a growth industry in recent years. Nita Krevans views *Id.* 15, one of the most unequivocally "urban" mimes, as a pastoral poem: the structural peculiarities of *Id.* 15 are compared to those of the canonically "bucolic" idylls (3 and 7) and of the urban fourth mime of Herodas, and the materialization of four motifs identified as essentially "pastoral" by modern critics (the herdsman, amoebean song, retreat, and simplicity) is investigated in both *Id.* 15 and the "bucolic" *Id.* 1 and 7. As well as reviewing problems of generic classification and formal labelling, Jay Reed takes up the question of the 'pastorality' of the "urban" *Id.* 2 and further shows how, against the Theocritean background, later bucolic texts take issue with their inheritance (wherein the love theme is a major touchstone for innovative drive), enter into dialogue with one another and blaze trails that lead into Virgil's *Eclogues*.

Hans Bernsdorff offers a full overview of the various aspects of post-Theocritean Greek bucolic poetry, illustrating developments in form, theme and representational mode and arguing that, for all their heterogeneity, practitioners of bucolic during this period are increasingly aware of working within a unified generic area.

Pastoral's *Umfunktionierung* in works removed both in time and generic features from Theocritus and his immediate Greek and Latin successors is yet another area that holds the promise of fresh insights and new perspectives. Alessandro Barchiesi discusses passages in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* where readers are likely to perceive echoes and adumbrations of pastoral: Ovid assumes both a bucolic tradition and scholarly debates about pastoral, and his contribution to its history often verges on parody and misquoting—ironically enough, since he takes from pastoral substantial cues towards his own poetics of 'landscape with eroticized figures'. The reversal of the pastoral world in Senecan drama is the central thesis of Alessandro Schiesaro's contribution: tormented by trauma, the landscapes of Seneca's tragedies stand in stark counterpoint to their idyllic models, elicit from them troubling implications and set up a powerful symbolism for a world abandoned by reason and dominated by passions. Byron Harris shows how Nonnus' epic *Dionysiaca* and Colluthus' epyllion make pastoral themes and allusions an integral part of their narrative movements: Nonnus eventually dissolves the harmony of pastoral song into the ample universe of Dionysiac polyphony, while in Colluthus' Hesiodic vision the world of pastoral projects lost innocence as a foil for evaluating the greed of Paris the abductor of Helen *vs* Paris the shepherd. Reaching out to 12th-cent. Byzantine novel, pastoral, as Joan Burton argues, asserts its presence in sophisticated allusions to the Theocritean world, in ecphrastic capsules and in extensive networks of intertextual recollection, which either set the stage for a symbolic statement of the dangers inherent in Dionysiac pastoral (Theodorus Prodromus) or provide opportunities for a decorative re-employment of pastoral scenery (Macrembolites).

The conceptualisation of pastoral as genre is closely linked to, and to a great extent originates from, the organization of poems in a collection, notably Virgil's, but Theocritus' as well. But whoever it was that first rounded up and penned the bucolic species in one fold, not only set what was probably just a thematic category on its way to acquiring an inner structure recognizable enough to develop into a generic entity but also triggered the quandary over the meaning of the particular layout of the pastoral book. Brian Breed picks up this thread in connection

with the *Eclogues* at a point where our collection of charts, designs and “bucolic chapels” is rife with speculation, ingenuity and a lot of special pleading, from the bluntly numerological to the bewilderingly abstract, and offers new perspectives on the *Eclogues* book as reading experience that both attends to and challenges the necessities of moving across the physical space and through time. Reclining herdsmen piping extempore the noontide away in some real-life Doric locale may not be the story or the whole story of pastoral’s origins, but pastoral encounters and plots, especially in the form of song competition, thrive on such reconstructions and thus lay a particularly strong claim to a fiction of orality at the same time as they celebrate their pervasive textuality. As well as touching on such tensions, Theodore Papangelis focuses on the *Eclogues*’ textualising moments and strategies and their impact on conceptions of generic tradition, time and history.

Probably by dint of a typical pastoral polarization, the idea of this collection was first floated in the very urban hubbub of a piazza in Trento. The editors, neither Arcadians nor precisely in their flourishing prime, *ad greges in unum compellendos* had thereafter to conduct their prolonged editorial amoebean through the cyberspace—a commendable experience of herding but one involving a number of less than idyllic difficulties. Therefore, it is hoped that they may be forgiven a brief moment of mutual praise for having negotiated them in the most genuine (and, of course, generically sanctioned) spirit of pastoral symmetry and camaraderie. They are, needless to say, grateful to all the contributors for the invariably graceful patience with which they responded to successive queries and suggestions, to Johanna Hanink for her valuable suggestions on points of English style, and to the staff of Brill Academic Publishers, in particular Mr Michiel Klein Swormink and his successor Dr Irene van Rossum, for the expertise expended on the editing of the volume.

Marco Fantuzzi
Theodore D. Papangelis

CONTRIBUTORS

Benjamin Acosta-Hughes is Associate Professor of Greek and Latin and of Comparative Literature at the University of Michigan. He has published articles on Callimachus, Posidippus, Sappho and Cavafy, and is a frequent reviewer of work on Hellenistic poetry. He is the author of *Polyeideia: the Iambi of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London 2002), and of *Cantat Alexandria: the Hellenistic Reception of Archaic Lyric* (forthcoming 2007); he is currently working (with Susan Stephens) on a book entitled *Callimachus in Context*.

Alessandro Barchiesi (University of Siena at Arezzo and Stanford University) is a Latinist, with research interests in Augustan poetry, in Roman imitations of Greek culture, and in literary theory. His recent work includes editing a multi-author commentary on Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (vol. 1, Fondazione Valla, Milan 2005; vol. 2, with Gianpiero Rosati, is expected in 2007), and the project of editing the *Oxford Handbook of Roman Studies* (with W. Scheidel); contributions to the Cambridge Companions to the Augustan Age, to Roman satire, to Horace, and to Greek lyric; a short guide to the Ancient Novel in Italian (with L. Graverini and W. Keulen, Rome 2006). With G. Guidorizzi, he is the editor of the Florentine journal *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica*.

Hans Bernsdorff is Professor of Classics at the Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt/Main. He has written books on Homer, Hellenistic poetry, and Ovid (*Zur Rolle des Aussehens im homerischen Menschenbild*, Göttingen 1992; *Das Fragmentum bucolicum Vindobonense (P. Vindob. Rainer 29801)*, Göttingen 1999; *Kunstwerke und Verwandlungen—Vier Studien zu ihrer Darstellung im Werk Ovids*, Frankfurt/Main 2000; *Die Darstellung von Hirten in der nicht-bukolischen Dichtung des Hellenismus*, Stuttgart 2001). His current areas of research are the Roman Neoterics and Greek elegy (especially on recently found papyri), and its reception in Rome.

Brian W. Breed is Assistant Professor of Classics at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. His research is focused on Latin poetry of

the late Republican and early Augustan periods, and he has authored articles on Virgil and the *Eclogues*, on Horace, on Propertius, and on Homer. With Andreola Rossi of Amherst College he has recently co-edited a volume of papers on Ennius and the Roman epic tradition. His book *Pastoral Inscriptions: Reading and Writing Virgil's Eclogues*, which examines the interplay between orality and textuality in Virgil's pastoral, is forthcoming.

Joan B. Burton is Professor and Chair of Classical Studies at Trinity University, San Antonio, Texas. Her publications include: "A Reemergence of Theocritean Poetry in the Byzantine Novel", *CPh* 98 (2003), 251–273, "Abduction and Elopement in the Byzantine Novel", *GRBS* 41 (2000), 377–409, and *Theocritus's Urban Mimes: Mobility, Gender, and Patronage* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London 1995). Her current research interests focus on Hellenistic poetry, as well as interactions between Byzantine and earlier Greek literature and culture.

Massimo Di Marco is Professor of Greek Language and Literature at the University of Rome "La Sapienza". He is the author of an edition and commentary of Timon's *Silli* (Rome 1989), and of the books *Sapienza italica: studi su Senofane, Empedocle, Ippone* (Rome 1998) and *La tragedia greca* (Rome 2000); he has also published extensively on classical and Hellenistic satyr play and comedy, Hellenistic epigram, Callimachus, and bucolic poetry. He has founded in 2000, and is associate editor of *Poesis: bibliografia della poesia greca*.

Marco Fantuzzi is Professor of Ancient Greek Literature at the University of Macerata and at the Graduate School of Greek and Latin Philology of the University of Florence. He is a member of the board of *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, *Materiali e Discussioni*, and *Seminari Romani di Cultura Greca*, and the author of *Bionis Smyrnaei Adonidis epitaphium*, Liverpool 1985; *Ricerche su Apollonio Rodio*, Rome, 1988; *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*, Cambridge 2004 (with R. Hunter). He has also edited (with R. Pretagostini) *Struttura e storia dell'esametro greco*, Rome 1995–1996. He is currently working on a full scale commentary on the *Rhesus* ascribed to Euripides.

Christopher A. Faraone is Frank Springer Professor of Classics at the University of Chicago. He has co-edited (with T.H. Carpenter) *Masks of Dionysus* (Ithaca NY and London 1993), (with D.B. Dodd) *Initiation*

in *Ancient Greek Rituals and Narratives: New Critical Perspectives* (London 2003), and (with L. McClure) *Prostitutes and Courtesans in the Ancient World* (Madison 2005). He is also the author of *Talismans and Trojan Horses: Guardian Statues in Ancient Greek Myth and Ritual* (New York and Oxford 1992) and *Ancient Greek Love Magic* (Cambridge MA and London 1999). He is currently working on a book on archaic Greek elegy and two further book projects: one on hymns and paeans to Apollo and another on incantations as a genre of hexametrical poetry.

Kathryn Gutzwiller is Professor of Classics at the University of Cincinnati. Her research interests include Hellenistic poetry and Latin elegy, women in antiquity, and literary theory. Her studies include *Studies in the Hellenistic Epyllion* (Königstein/Ts. 1981); *Theocritus' Pastoral Analogies: The Formation of a Genre* (Madison 1991); *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London 1998), for which she received the Goodwin Award of Merit; and an edited volume entitled *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book* (2005). Forthcoming is *Guide to Hellenistic Literature* for Blackwell Publishers, and she is currently working on an edition and commentary for the epigrams of Meleager, to be published by Oxford University Press.

Byron Harries now studies in partial retirement, while continuing to teach classical languages and literature at the University of Wales, Swansea. He has published work on Homer, Nonnus, Cicero, and Ovid, as well as on neo-Latin poetry. He is currently preparing innovative approaches to the critical appreciation of the *Thebaid* of Statius and *Halieutica* of Oppian, and is still regularly engaged with Nonnus' two poetic masterpieces.

Thomas Hubbard is Professor of Classics at the University of Texas, Austin. After receiving his Ph.D. from Yale in 1980, he has authored numerous articles on Greek and Latin poetry, and three books: *The Pindaric Mind* (Leiden 1985), *The Mask of Comedy: Aristophanes and the Intertextual Parabasis* (Ithaca NY and London 1991), and *The Pipes of Pan: Intertextuality and Literary Filiation from Theocritus to Milton* (Ann Arbor 1998). He has also edited *Greek Love Reconsidered* (New York 2000) and *Homosexuality in Greece and Rome: A Sourcebook of Basic Documents* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London 2003). He is currently finishing books on Greek Masculinity and the Cultural Politics of Greek Athletics.

Richard Hunter is Regius Professor of Greek at the University of Cambridge and a Fellow of Trinity College. His research interests include ancient comedy, the novel, ancient literary criticism, and Hellenistic poetry and its reception in Rome. His most recent books are *Theocritus, Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London 2003), *Plato's Symposium* (Oxford and New York 2004), and (with M. Fantuzzi) *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge 2004); he is the editor of *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions* (Cambridge 2005).

Nita Krevans teaches Greek and Latin at the University of Minnesota. Hellenistic poetry has always been a particular focus of her research, and she is the co-author (with Alex Sens) of the "Language and Literature" chapter of the forthcoming Cambridge Companion to the Hellenistic World. Her recent work includes essays on Callimachus, Apollonius, Virgil, and the new Posidippus papyrus. She is also the author of a forthcoming study of Greek and Roman poetic books, *The Poet as Editor*.

Enrico Magnelli, Ph.D. (2000), University of Florence, has been Research Fellow at the Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa, and at the University of Florence (2000–2005). He is currently teaching Greek & Latin languages at the Liceo "Machiavelli" of Florence. He has written extensively on Hellenistic and Late Greek poetry, Attic comedy, Greek metre, and 'classicizing' Byzantine poetry, and published *Studi su Euforione* (Rome 2002) and the commented edition of *Alexandri Aetoli testimonia et fragmenta* (Florence 1999). He is preparing a book on the re-use of Homer in Greek comedy and satyr play, and a critical edition of the fragments of Euphorion.

Roland Mayer is Professor of Classics in the University of London. He has published commentaries on Seneca's *Phaedra* (with M. Coffey, Cambridge 1990), Horace's *Epistles*, book 1 (Cambridge 1994), and Tacitus' *Dialogus de oratoribus* (Cambridge 2001), written widely on a number of other Roman authors and issues, chiefly focused upon the literature of the early principate, and coedited (with S. Morton Braund) *Love & Latin Literature: amor: roma: Eleven Essays (and One Poem) by Former Research Students, Presented to E.J. Kenney on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (Cambridge 1999). He is currently producing a commentary on the first book of Horace's *Odes*, and a study of the Roman value concept *gloria*.

Ruurd R. Nauta is Professor of Latin at the University of Groningen. His research is mainly on Roman poetry, its historical contexts and the theoretical concepts used in studying it. He is the author of *Poetry for Patrons. Literary Communication in the Age of Domitian* (Leiden 2002) and co-editor of *Catullus' Poem on Attis* (Leiden 2005) and *Flavian Poetry* (Leiden 2006).

Theodore D. Papangelis, Ph.D. (1985) in Classics, University of Cambridge, is Professor of Latin at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. He is the author of *Propertius: A Hellenistic Poet on Love and Death* (Cambridge 1987) and co-editor of *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius* (Leiden 2001). He has published chiefly on Augustan poets and is the author of books on the Roman Neoterics and Virgil's *Eclogues* (in Greek). His research interests include Hellenistic poetry and literary theory.

Roberto Pretagostini is Professor of Greek Literature at the University of Rome "Tor Vergata". Hellenistic poetry, Greek comedy, and metrics are his main research interests, and his published work includes *Ricerche sulla poesia alessandrina. Teocrito, Callimaco, Sotade* (Rome 1984) and (with G.A. Privitera) *Storia e forme della letteratura greca* (Milan 1997). He has also edited *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all'età ellenistica: scritti in onore di B. Gentili* (Rome 1993), *La letteratura ellenistica: problemi e prospettive di ricerca* (Rome 2000), and, with B. Gentili, *La musica in Grecia* (Rome 1988), with M. Fantuzzi, *Struttura e storia dell'esametro greco* (Rome 1995–1996), with E. Dettori, *La cultura ellenistica: l'opera letteraria e l'esegesi antica* (Rome 2004). He is associate editor of *Seminari Romani di Cultura Greca* and *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*.

Joseph D. Reed is Assistant Professor of Greek and Latin at the University of Michigan. His main interests lie in Hellenistic and Latin poetry, especially as they represent cultural identity; he currently has a book forthcoming on Virgil's *Aeneid* and a commentary in progress on Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 10–12. He has also published on the ancient cult and myth of Adonis and on their reception in nineteenth- and twentieth-century literature.

Alessandro Schiesaro is Professor of Latin at King's College, London. He is the author of *Simulacrum et imago: gli argomenti analogici nel De rerum natura* (Pisa 1990) and *The Passions in Play: Thyestes and the Dynamics of Senecan Drama* (Cambridge 2003), as well as the co-editor of *Mega Nēpios*:

The Addressee in Didactic Epic (= MD 31, 1993) and *The Roman Cultural Revolution* (Cambridge 1997). He is now working on Virgil's *Aeneid*.

Alexander Sens is Professor of Classics at Georgetown University, Washington DC. He is the author of numerous articles, especially on late Classical and Hellenistic Greek poetry, and of three books: *Theocritus. Dioscuri (Idyll 22)* (Göttingen 1997) and, with S. Douglas Olson, *Matro of Pitane and the Tradition of Epic Parody in the Fourth Century BCE* (Atlanta 1999), and *Archestratos of Gela* (Oxford 2000). He is currently finishing an edition of Asclepiades of Samos for Oxford University Press; his next project will be a commentary on select Hellenistic epigrams for Cambridge University Press.

Susan Stephens is Professor of Classics at Stanford University. Trained as a papyrologist, her earlier work includes *Ancient Greek Novels: the Fragments*, co-authored with Jack Winkler (Princeton 1995). Her recent work on the political and social context of Hellenistic poetry includes a number of articles on Callimachus, Posidippus of Pella, and Apollonius, and a book-length study: *Seeing Double: Intercultural Poetics in the Ptolemaic Court* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London 2003).

ABBREVIATIONS

Standard abbreviations have been used for ancient authors and works, modern collections of fragments and editions of texts, mainly in accordance with the practice of the 3rd ed. of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*.

The following may also be noted:

- AGNF = S. Stephens and J.J. Winkler, *Ancient Greek Novels: The Fragments*, Princeton 1995
ANRW = H. Temporini and W. Haase (eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Berlin and New York 1972–
Ausführl.Lex.Mythologie = W.R. Roscher (ed.), *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, Leipzig and Berlin 1884–1937
CA = J.U. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina*, Oxford 1925
CEG = P.A. Hansen, *Carmina epigraphica Graeca*, Berlin and New York 1983 and 1989
Enciclopedia virgiliana = F. Della Corte *et al.* (eds.), *Enciclopedia virgiliana*, Rome 1984–1991
FGE = D.L. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams*, Cambridge 1981
FGrHist = F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Berlin 1923–1930; Leiden 1940–1958; continued by Ch.W. Fornara *et al.*, Leiden 1994–
FLP = E. Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*, Oxford 1993 (paperback ed. with addenda, 2003)
GPh = A.S.F. Gow and D.L. Page, *The Greek Anthology. The Garland of Philip*, Cambridge 1968
GVI = W. Peek, *Griechische Vers-Inschriften*, vol. 1, Berlin 1955
HE = A.S.F. Gow and D.L. Page, *The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic Epigrams*, Cambridge 1965
IEG = M.L. West, *Iambi et elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*, (2nd ed.) Oxford 1989–1992
IMEGR = E. Bernand, *Inscriptions métriques de l'Égypte gréco-romaine*, Paris 1949
LIMC = *Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae*, Zurich and Munich 1981–1997
LSJ = H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. Stuart Jones, R. McKenzie, P.G.W. Glare, and A.A. Thompson, *Greek–English Lexicon, with a Revised Supplement*, (9th ed.), Oxford 1996
Der neue Pauly = H. Cancik and H. Schneider (eds.), *Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*, Stuttgart 1996–2002 (Engl. trans. in progress, Leiden 2002–)
PCG = R. Kassel and C. Austin, *Poetae comici Graeci*, Berlin and New York 1983–
PMG = D.L. Page, *Poetae melici Graeci*, Oxford 1962
PMGF = M. Davies, *Poetarum melicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, vol. 1, Oxford 1991

- RE* = A. Pauly, G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, *et al.* (eds.), *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Stuttgart and Munich 1893–1980
- SH* = H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons, *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, Berlin and New York 1983
- TrGF* = B. Snell, R. Kannicht, and S. Radt, *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, Göttingen 1971–2004
- VS* = H. Diels and W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, (6th ed.) Berlin 1951–1952.

THE HERDSMAN IN GREEK THOUGHT

KATHRYN GUTZWILLER

Herdsmen were surely a familiar sight in the ancient Greek countryside. While some evidence exists for large flocks owned by wealthy men and the seasonal practice of transhumance, it was also common practice, at least in the classical and Hellenistic periods, to pasture smaller herds and flocks in close proximity to planted fields.¹ In the latter case of animal husbandry practiced in conjunction with farming, the herdsmen were frequently members of a family who owned a small farm, while, in the case of larger herds, they were typically slaves or hired men who worked alone or in small groups to pasture the animals. As a result, herdsmen were low-status individuals in Greek culture, and before Theocritus they appear in literature as marginal figures or somewhat more prominently only in those genres, like satyr drama or comic poetry, that feature persons “worse than ourselves”.²

The question that arises, then, is why Theocritus, in writing dramatic mimes, came to focus so often on the herdsman, both in his more

¹ Scholars disagree about whether animal husbandry in classical and Hellenistic Greece was more commonly practiced on separate upland pastures and involved transhumance or whether the model of mixed farming and husbandry was more typical. For the first model, see Georgoudi (1974), Skydsgaard (1988), Isager and Skydsgaard (1992) 83–107, especially 99–104, and, on the survey evidence for Arcadia, Forsén and Forsén (2003) 266–267; for the second, see Hodkinson (1988), on Aetolia, Doorn and Bommeljé (1990), and, on the southern Argolid, Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel (1994) 285–301, especially 298. Apparently both types of herding occurred at certain times and places, but in the ancient system of transhumance, unlike in the modern Greece, slaves or hired men rather than owners accompanied the herds; for a more synthetic view, see Forbes (1994). Somewhat different is the society depicted in Homer, which was built on a pastoral economy involving flocks owned by wealthy men; for the Homeric evidence, see Ryder (1983) 143–144, Hodkinson (1990) 142–143, and, for the changed situation in Hesiod, Athanassakis (1992). In Italy, according to Varro (*Rust.* 2.29), separate summer and winter pastures were the rule, at least for sheep; see Ryder (1983) 158.

² Arist. *Poet.* 2.6–7 (1448a), where the literary characters deemed “worse than ourselves” apparently (despite the uncertainty caused by a lacuna) include the Cyclops as depicted in nomes or dithyrambs by Timotheus and Philoxenus. For the relationship of Theocritus’ *Idylls* to this Aristotelian theoretical division of literature, see Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 138–141.

realistic guise and as a figure of the quasi-mythical past. This question is important, of course, because Theocritus' innovative focus resulted in the development of the new genre of pastoral, which transcended Greek culture to figure prominently in the repertoire of ancient genres inherited by the modern world. In part, as it seems, Theocritus was reflecting the herding culture of his native Sicily, as well as a tradition about herdsmen-singers that likely played some role in earlier Sicilian poetry.³ But, I suggest, the cultural implications of the herdsman figure evident in earlier Greek literature were also an important factor, one that contributed to the complexity of Theocritus' herding poetry in comparison with his other mimelike compositions. In short, the herdsman was "good to think with", or, as I have put it elsewhere, before Theocritus he was most commonly a figure of analogy rather than the character of focus.⁴ As a result, even Theocritus' most inept and comical herdsmen invite readers to think, analogously, of the similarity to themselves or others.

1. *Peace and order in the pasture and beyond*

Theocritus' *Id.* 16 contains one of the most beautiful descriptions of peace in Greek literature. After projecting the victory of Hiero II over the Carthaginian forces that were threatening his native Syracuse, the poet offers this vision of the conditions that victory will bring to the Sicilian countryside (ll. 90–97):

ἄγρους δ' ἐργάζοιντο τεθαλότας· αἱ δ' ἀνάριθμοι
μήλων χιλιάδες βοτάνᾳ διαπιανθεῖσαι
ἄμ πεδῖον βληχῶντο, βόες δ' ἀγελῆδόν ἐς αὖλιν
ἐρχόμεναι σκνιφαῖον ἐπισπεύδοιεν ὀδίταν·
νέοι δ' ἐκπονέοιντο ποτὶ σπόρον, ἀνίκα τέττιξ
ποιμένας ἐνδίοις πεφυλαγμένος ὑψόθι δένδρων
ἄχεϊ ἐν ἀκρεμόνεσσιν· ἀράχνια δ' εἰς ὄπλ' ἀράχλαι
λεπτὰ διαστήσαιντο, βοᾶς δ' ἔτι μῆδ' ὄνομ' εἴη.

³ For instance, Stesichorus of Himera wrote about the Daphnis legend (Ael. *VH* 10.18 = *PMGF* 279; see, however, Reed's different opinion, below, p. 213 n. 18), and Epicharmus composed a Cyclops (*PCG* 70–72) as well as mentioning in two different plays a certain Diomus who was said to have invented *boucoliasmos*, or competitive singing among herdsmen (Ath. 14.619a–b). See Hunter (1999) 9–11.

⁴ See Gutzwiller (1991) 23–79.

May they tend flourishing fields. May countless thousands of sheep, fattened on the pasture, bleat throughout the plain, and may the cattle returning as a herd to the stead hasten along the evening traveler. May the fallow fields be worked for sowing, while the cicada, watching over the shepherds in the sun, makes music high above in the tree branches. May spiders spin their thin webs over weapons of war, and may there no longer be even a word for battle cry.

Here Theocritus focuses away from human agency to present the animal world as a source of bounty, protection, and pleasure. Sounds include the contented bleating of fattened sheep, while cattle returning at evening to the stead, seemingly without any herdsman, guide the solitary traveler. In a line that recalls both a famous Homeric simile (*Il.* 3.151–152) and Hesiod's description of summer's leisure (*Op.* 582–584), a cicada chirping from on high in the trees offers protection to shepherds during the noon's heat. Finally, the most delicate of natural substances, a spider's web, encases the arms of war, as the shout of battle fades so completely that even the word itself is no more. In all likelihood, this extended description of nature is offered to Hiero as an example of the type of poetry Theocritus might compose under his patronage. In addition to the Homeric and Hesiodic echoes, the delicacy of the spider's web (λεπτά) recalls the quality of λεπτότης that the Alexandrian poets Philitas and Callimachus advocated as the new standard for poetry written under the protection of Hellenistic monarchs like the Ptolemies.⁵ The utter silencing of the battle cry suggests as well a type of poetry that will concern the peaceful countryside instead of martial themes of epic. In making this plea for Hiero to embrace his bucolic poetry (if so the lines may be read),⁶ Theocritus is working within a well-established literary/cultural tradition in which the herding world was an emblem of order, harmony, and peace.

⁵ In the prologue to the *Aetia*, Callimachus asserts a preference for the short, refined poetry of Mimnermus, and apparently Philitas, which he calls αἱ κατὰ λεπτόν / ῥήσεις] (fr. 1.11–12 Pfeiffer = Massimilla), a phrase later used as the title, *Catalepton*, for the short poetry attributed to the young Virgil. In the same prologue as well, Apollo advises the young Callimachus to cultivate a “slender Muse” (Μοῦσαν ... λεπταλέην, fr. 1.24 Pf. = M.). The “slenderness” of Philitas' verse was apparently the source of various accounts of his extreme thinness as an individual, as in Ael. *VH* 9.14 and Ath. 12.552b; see Bing (2003) 331–333, revising Cameron's view (1995) 488–493 that his actual thinness resulted in a standing joke in comedy. Aratus as well was praised for the λεπτότης of his verse; see Callim. *AP* 9.507 = *HE* 1297ff.; Leon. *AP* 9.25 = *HE* 2572ff., and Aratus' use of the acrostic at *Phaen.* 783–787.

⁶ For a more detailed reading of the poem along these lines, see Gutzwiller (1983a).

Already in the *Iliad* the peaceful countryside filled with scenes of animals grazing offers contrast to epic's focus on violence and war.⁷ In the universalizing picture presented by Homer's description of Achilles' shield (*Il.* 18.483–608), five scenes are devoted to rural life, three of which represent the farmer's annual cycle of planting and harvesting and two, probably on a separate circle of the shield, depict herding: a herd of cattle accompanied by four herdsmen shown as two lions attack a bull, and a flock of sheep grazing peacefully. The prominence of these rural scenes on the shield offers a normalizing contrast to descriptions of violence and death that prevail elsewhere in the *Iliad*. In the description of a city at war, contrasted with one at peace, there is again a scene of two herdsmen, playing *syringes* as they tend their cattle, and these lines are often quoted as the earliest bucolic note in Greek literature (*Il.* 18.525–526):

οἱ δὲ τάχα προγέγοντο, δύο δ' ἄμ' ἔποντο νομῆες
τερόμενοι σύριγξιν· δόλον δ' οὐ τι προνόησαν.

They [the cattle] moved forward quickly, and two herdsmen followed, taking pleasure in their pipes; they were not at all aware of the ambush.

Though here the herders' self-absorption in their music foreshadows the rustic pleasure showcased in later pastoral poetry, Homer has embedded them in a scene of violence, since in the next narrative moment armed men emerge from ambush to raid the cattle and kill the herders. The emphasis is on their vulnerability and unawareness of danger. Many references to herdsmen in Homer occur in similes in which a wild animal, often a lion, attacks a herd animal; in these similes the attacking animal stands for the victorious warrior and the herd animal the defeated one, while the herdsmen are often absent or act ineffectually.⁸ The same sort of attitude to the herdsman, as the antithesis of the warrior, underlies the background myth of Paris, whose transformation from cowherd on Mt. Ida to selfish prince and cowardly fighter leads to Troy's destruction.⁹ Much later, the chorus of Euripides' *Iphigeneia*

⁷ For anticipations of pastoral poetry in Homer, see Gutzwiller (1991) 24–44, Griffin (1992), and Bernsdorff (2001) 50–66.

⁸ As, for instance, *Il.* 10.485–486, 15.323–325, 15.630–636, 16.352–355, 17.61–67. Bernsdorff (2001) 54–57 argues for the heroic quality of the herdsman in Homer by citing similes in which herdsmen attempt to protect the herd animals against a predator, but as Haubold (2000) 19–20 (with 28–46) demonstrates, the Homeric shepherd is typically ill-equipped to protect his flock and often loses them. On the herding similes in Homer more generally, see Lonsdale (1990).

⁹ The one reference to the three goddesses appearing to Paris at his stead in *Il.*

at *Aulis* (579–589) describes how, after the judgment of the goddesses, Paris abandons his flourishing cows, as if in a state of madness, to seek the promised pleasure of Helen, with the result that their mutual *eros* produces *eris* for both Greece and Troy.

The association of pastoral life with political peace depends upon generalization from the part to the whole, or, since herdsmen were normally low-status individuals, often just slaves, on Greek fascination with the category of the “other”, of those “like/unlike us”. Within the pastoral realm—that part of the landscape separating the inaccessible mountain tops from the settled fields and urban centers—the herdsman has sole responsibility for establishing good order and harmony. One of the most common Homeric epithets, ποιμὴν λαῶν, “shepherd of the people”, draws the military leader into comparison with the herdsman on that basis.¹⁰ As the word ποιμὴν derives from an Indo-European root *pō(i) that conveys the idea of feeding and caring for animals, the phrase suggests, at the basic level, the leader’s duty to care for and preserve the people.¹¹ The epithet is, then, most commonly applied to Agamemnon as the overlord of the Greek host rather than as warrior. Achilles’ criticism of him as δημοβόρος βασιλεύς, “king who devours his people” (*Il.* 1.231) indicates that Agamemnon’s unjust distribution of the booty places him in the category of bad shepherds who misuse their flocks, as, for example, Melanthius in the *Odyssey* who diminishes his animals to satisfy the demands of the suitors (17.204–259). In fact, the later and more general term for herdsman, νομεύς, reflects a specifically Greek cultural association between the herding and orderly distribution, which in early Greek thought was the basis for a just treatment of others. From the root of the verb νέμω, “distribute in an orderly fashion”, comes not only νομεύς, but also νομός, “place of pasture”, and with a change of accent, νόμος, “custom/law”.¹² Although the Homeric poems reflect Greek society before the establishment of law codes,

24.29–30 shows that Homer knew and presumed his audience knew the story of the judgment on Mt. Ida. Cf. Athena’s question to Hermes about Paris in Lucian’s *Dearum iud.* 4: “does he have any desire for war and is he a lover of glory, or is he all cowherd?”.

¹⁰ See Gutzwiller (1991) 24–29, Collins (1996) 19–39, Haubold (2000) 17–46, and Bernsdorff (2001) 53–61.

¹¹ The idea of the “shepherd of the people” was present throughout the civilizations of the Mediterranean and the Near East; see Halperin (1983a) 97–104, Murray (1990), and Collins (1996) 21–23. Benveniste (1973) 371–376 argues, on the basis of etymology, that the formula ποιμὴν λαῶν goes back to a pastoral/military society that encompassed both Phrygia and the Thessalian and Aeolic areas of northeastern Greece.

¹² For the linguistic development of the root *nem- in Greek, see Laroche (1949).

already the term εὐνομία (*Od.* 17.487), as the opposite of *hybris*, refers to right treatment of other human beings, while later in Solon (*IEG* 4.32) and Xenophanes (*IEG* 2.19) the word denotes just governance within the polis. It is part of the same system of associations that in Hesiod the city of just men enjoys “child-nourishing peace” (*Op.* 228), marked, in part, by successful herding in the form of “woolly sheep” that “are laden with heavy fleeces” (l. 234).

In the 5th-cent. Greek philosophers began to use the analogy of the herdsman to the ruler as a way of thinking about the nature of social order and governance.¹³ It appears from a number of passages that Socrates was fond of recalling Homer’s ποιμὴν λαῶν in order to define the good general (Xenophon, *Mem.* 3.2.1), good king (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.2.14), or good lawgiver (Ps.-Plato, *Minos* 321b–c). The basis for the analogy was ἐπιμέλεια, the duty to care for one’s human charges, just as the herdsman should care for his animals (cf. Pl. *Plt.* 275b). Because Socrates, or at least Plato, was a supporter of *nomos* rather than *physis* as the basis for human societal relationships, the herding image often involved word play with νέμω/νόμος. In the *Minos*, for instance, shepherds and cowherds are said to provide the best laws (νόμοι) for sheep and cows as kings do for human beings (318a). Minos and Rhadamanthus, as the best lawgivers of old, are called “apportioners/herders and shepherds of men (νομῆς τε καὶ ποιμένες ἀνδρῶν) just as Homer called the good general a shepherd of the people” (321b–c).¹⁴ But in the *Republic* (343b–c) Thrasymachus, a supporter of the natural right of the stronger, turns Socrates’ analogy against him, by suggesting that herdsmen tend and fatten their animals, not for the sake of the animals, but for the benefit of their masters and themselves. Likewise, he argues, rulers manage their states to suit their own interests, not those of their subjects (cf. Pl. *Tht.* 174d–e and *Plt.* 276e on the tyrant as an uncouth shepherd). In this way, the herdsman analogy becomes closely associated with the important debate about the nature of justice in 5th-cent. political theory. Plato’s description of the ideal state, in which the shepherd analogizes both to the philosopher-king and to the rational part of the mind (*Resp.* 440d), is offered as refutation of Thrasymachus’ argument.

¹³ See Skemp (1952) 52–66, Gutzwiller (1991) 67–73, and Schofield (1999) 107–108.

¹⁴ Cf. too the extended analogy of the ruler to a herdsman in Plato, *Plt.* 261d–262a, 263e–68c, 275a–76e.

Pastoralism, as a stage in the evolution of human society, often appears in the theoretical discussions of political life that took place in the classical period. Plato was particularly fond of composing anthropological accounts in which the pastoral life represented a lost and idealized period of peace. In the *Laws* (677a–680e), for instance, he describes a period after the great flood when men lived in a state of friendliness to one another because their lives remained simple but food was plentiful enough that it did not provoke quarrels (678d–e). The people of this imaginary time were herdsmen, who lived on milk and meat. They had the necessities of life, such as clothing, houses, cooking vessels, but had not yet discovered the art of metallurgy. Consequently, they were neither excessively poor, nor did they have the gold and silver that leads to wealth. As simple-minded individuals, they were morally good, and they knew nothing of *hybris*, injustice, rivalry, or jealousy. They had not yet developed the arts of war, nor did they have even a name for lawsuits and civil strife (679d). For Plato, this evolutionary stage of living in family groups or small clans represented the period of greatest justice since people followed “the laws of their fathers” and were therefore governed by the “most just of all kingships” (680e).

In contrast, the Peripatetic tradition conceived the pastoral age more negatively. Following Aristotle’s view that the nomadic existence was one of savagery since herdsmen lived a life of leisure without the hard work required by agriculture (*Plt.* 1256a), Dicaearchus (fr. 49 Wehrli = 56A Mirhady, from Porph. *Abst.* 4.2; cf. Varro, *Rust.* 2.1.3–5) made the taming of animals and pastoral existence the second stage of human development, the one that followed the peaceful age of Cronus, when men lived happily off the bounty of the land.¹⁵ In this account, the taming of animals led to desire for superfluous possessions, the beginning of warfare, and a striving after distinction (*φιλοτιμίαν*) within a stratified society. The philosophical schools developed in the 4th century provided, then, for both positive and negative assessments of pastoralism as a way of life, but in either case the herdsman was presented as something much more than the low-status individual common in the upland pastures, since he stood for everyman at a certain stage of human existence.

¹⁵ For discussion of Aristotle’s hostile view of nomadic herdsmen, see Shaw (1982/83) 17–20, who documents the persistently hostile attitude of ancient sources to nomads; recent discussion of Dicaearchus’ anthropology in Schütrumpf (2001). Of course, noma-

The analogy between herdsman and ruler continued to play a role in political and ethical thought well into the Hellenistic period, though in forms reflecting the movement away from polis life toward monarchies. In the *Nicomachean Ethics* (1161a), Aristotle identified one form of friendship in the attitude of the good king toward his subjects, as revealed “through his superiority in benevolence” (ἐν ὑπεροχῇ εὐεργεσίας):

εὖ γὰρ ποιεῖ τοὺς βασιλευμένους, εἴπερ ἀγαθὸς ὢν ἐπιμελεῖται αὐτῶν, ἵν’ εὖ πράττωσιν, ὥσπερ νομεὺς προβάτων· ὅθεν καὶ Ὅμηρος τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα ποιμένα λαῶν εἶπεν.

For he treats his subjects well, if being a good king he takes care that they flourish, just like a herdsman his sheep. For that reason Homer calls Agamemnon the shepherd of the people.

Although the terminology is much the same as in the 5th-cent. discussions, there are now differences that reflect the development of Macedonian hegemony: the ruler is specifically a *basileus* and the basis for his good treatment is not equitable distribution, but largess.

Even more relevant to the developing theory of monarchic rule is the description of the ideal state offered by the Stoic Zeno of Citium in his *Republic*. The principal idea underlying this state, according to Plutarch’s account (*Alex. fortuna* 329a–c), was that “we are not to live in cities and demes, each separated into our own just communities, but we are to consider all human beings our demesmen and citizens, and there is to be one way of living and one order, just as when a herd pasturing together is nourished by common law” (ὥσπερ ἀγέλης συννόμου νόμῳ κοινῷ συντρεφομένης). Zeno wrote this as if he were offering a dream or image of the good order (εὐνομίας) that belongs to the philosopher and to the constitution”.¹⁶ Here of course it is the Stoic idea of “common law” and universal citizenship that had such strong influence on Hellenistic and Roman political theory and activity, but for our purposes it is important to note that Plutarch preserves this information about the Stoic ideal state in praise of Alexander, to report that he made Zeno’s theory a reality. The description of Zeno’s republic is offered in the context of the differing advice on sovereignty provided Alexander by Aristotle and by the Stoic. Aristotle advised him to act as leader of the Greeks but master of the barbarians by “caring for”

dic pastoralism was associated with foreigners, since it was not the pattern followed in the Greek herding economy.

¹⁶ Schofield (1999) 104–111 argues that the herding analogy in this passage is Plutarchan rather than Stoic; see, however, Alesse (1998) 37–38.

(ἐπιμελόμενος, 329b) the Greeks like friends or relatives but treating his other subjects like animals or plants. Zeno, on the other hand, advised him to consider himself a force for peace and harmony among all his subjects so that they would consider the entire world their homeland.

This conjunction of uses of the herding analogy by Aristotle and Zeno strongly suggests that early Hellenistic monarchs familiar with contemporary political philosophy would have viewed the life of herdsmen as a potential reflection of their own manner of ruling their kingdoms. In his appeal to Hiero in *Id.* 16, Theocritus makes it clear that successful pastoral life is contingent upon the maintenance of stability in the world beyond, and ancient accounts of the ritual origin of bucolic poetry (*Prolegom.* Ba, pp. 2–3 Wendel; *Anecd. Estense* III.1–2, pp. 7–9 W.) indicate that readers connected the genre closely with the maintenance of peace.¹⁷ In one version bucolic poetry was invented at the time of the Persian invasion when Greece was threatened by the “disturbance caused by war” (τὴν ἐκ τοῦ πολέμου ταραχὴν, *Prolegom.* Ba p. 2 W.), and in another account it originated during civil dissension in Syracuse, after social harmony had been reestablished through negotiations conducted under the protection of Artemis. In commemoration of this event, rustics sang hymns to the goddess, and this gave rise to the custom of bucolic singing contests, in which contestants imitating herdsmen adopted a certain costume that included carrying loaves of bread shaped like animals, a pouch full of seeds, a wine skin, and a herdsman’s staff. As one ancient commentator explains, “the bread, wine, and libations were symbols of peace” (ὁ μὲν ἄρτος καὶ ὁ οἶνος καὶ ἡ σπονδὴ σημεῖα εἰρήνης ἦσαν) since, “as the story goes, bucolic song was discovered at a time of peace” (ἐπὶ εἰρήνῃ γάρ, ὥς ῥηθήσεται, εὖρηται τὰ βουκολικά, *Anecd. Estense* III.1, p. 7 W.).

Although the herdsmen in Theocritus’ strictly pastoral *Idylls* seem unaware of potential threats from military activity or civil disturbances, concern for good order in nature—especially through control of the herd animals—is nevertheless much in evidence. At the opening of *Id.* 1, for instance, the soothing sounds made by rustling trees and a trickling spring harmonize with the herdsmen’s piping and singing to reflect a peaceful oneness of man and nature. Likewise, at the close of *Id.* 6 a performance on *syrinx* and *aulos* by Daphnis and Damoetas is

¹⁷ For a modern argument that accepts these rituals as the origin of almost everything in later pastoral, see Hathorn (1961); a more skeptical discussion with earlier scholarship in Halperin (1983a) 81–84.

accompanied by the “dancing” of calves (ὄρχεῦντ’, 6.45), whose rhythmic movements reflect the herdsmen’s sympathetic understanding.¹⁸ In *Id.* 4, by contrast, when the cowherd Aegon goes off to compete in the Olympic games, the cows waste away with longing for their master while the bumbling Corydon, left in charge, lacks even a staff to keep them from wandering from their pasturage. When later in *Daphnis and Chloe* a herdsman attempts to reestablish a wayward ewe in her former εὐνομία, “good pasturage” (1.5.1), Longus, by thus reinterpreting a word that elsewhere refers to good governance, plays the pastoral trick of insinuating the broader realm of societal order back into the simplicity of the pasture.

The key innovation in Theocritus’ pastoral mimes was to focus on the limited world of the herdsman, so that the more expansive realm for which it may stand is present only implicitly, through the reader’s sophisticated knowledge of traditional patterns of thought. When he associates orderly control of animals, or lack thereof, with the emotional experiences of his herdsmen, he is making personal, by evoking the internal life we all share, a connection between herding and social order that has deep roots in Greek culture. If the ruler of Theocritus’ native Syracuse was perhaps unresponsive to the possibility of being celebrated through such poetic imagery, it may be that the more sophisticated Ptolemies better appreciated the implications of his dramatic sketches of herding life. From this perspective, Virgil’s more overt references to the effects of war and civil strife on the herdsman should not be viewed as an entirely new strand in bucolic poetry, but a different manner of acknowledging the strong cultural association between herding life and peace.

2. *Intellectual activity: The herdsman as philosopher/poet*

The herdsman’s relationship to his animals brings him into comparison not only with those who provide order in human society but also with those who impose order on thought.¹⁹ The similarity/difference of

¹⁸ In Eur. *Alc.* 583–587 a dappled fawn dances to the accompaniment of Apollo’s cithara. But see Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 168–169, who argues, citing Ath. 1.21a, that Theocritus may mean to convey only that the calves are leaping and that the line was later given a sentimentalizing reading in accordance with the mannerist interest in the pathetic fallacy.

¹⁹ See Gutzwiller (1991) 29–44, 73–79.

the sophisticated intellectual to the herdsman underlies the encounter of the aspiring urban poet Simichidas with the goatherd Lycidas in *Id.* 7. When Simichidas, who has from antiquity been associated with Theocritus, meets the rustic Lycidas on a midday journey from the city of Cos to the country estate of some aristocratic friends, he immediately notes Lycidas' status as the "most outstanding *syrtinx*-player among herdsmen and reapers" (ll. 28–29) and voices his own expectation of competing with him as an equal (ἰσοφαρίζειν ἔλπομαι, ll. 30–31). In proposing that they exchange bucolic songs (βουκολιασδώμεσθα, l. 36), he asserts, with parallelism of linguistic structure, that he is himself said by everyone to be the "best poet", although he remains unconvinced that he surpasses Asclepiades and Philitas, who are tuneful grasshoppers while he is a croaking frog. Lycidas, accepting this self-effacement for the clever irony it is, agrees to the bucolic exchange, and they perform songs with similar structures and themes, as Lycidas sings of his love for the boy Ageanax in a pastoral ambience and Simichidas sings of his friend Aratus' love for the boy Philinus from a more urban perspective. After the songs Lycidas presents Simichidas with a herdsman's staff "as a guest-gift from the Muses" (l. 129) and turns aside from the road, as Simichidas and his traveling companions proceed to their hosts' estate. The poem ends with an extended and impressionistic description of the harvest festival, or Thalsysia, at which the party reclines amid the enchanting sounds of nature in a grove near a spring, to feast on produce of the land and to drink the local wine mixed with pure spring water. The details of this poem allude quite directly to key texts in earlier Greek literature in which a herdsman is transformed into a poet or a *locus amoenus* is presented as a place of poetic or intellectual inspiration.

The most important of these passages appears in the opening of the *Theogony* (ll. 1–34), where Hesiod justifies his ability to sing of the early generations of the gods. He first addresses the Muses of Mt. Helicon by describing how they bathe in the stream Permessus and the Hippocrene spring before dancing and singing of the immortal gods. Hesiod then explains that the Muses "taught" (ἐδίδαξαν, l. 22) him song, while he was pasturing his sheep on Mt. Helicon, by giving him a staff of laurel, breathing divine speech into him, and bidding him to sing the genealogies of the gods. The Muses' exact words to Hesiod are among the most famous in Greek literature, but for our purposes it is important to notice that they are addressed to him not just as a potential poet but more expressly as one of the class of shepherds (ll. 26–28):

ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι, κάκ' ἐλέγχεα, γαστέρες οἶον,
 ἴδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα,
 ἴδμεν δ' εὖτ' ἐθέλωμεν ἀληθέα γηρύσασθαι.

Shepherds of the field, base reproaches, pure bellies, we know how to speak many falsehoods like to the truth, and we know, when we wish, how to say true things.

The address to “shepherds of the field” constitutes a reproach because, as the Muses say, herdsmen are “pure bellies”, a commonplace slur referring to their propensity to satisfy their desire for pleasure.²⁰ This susceptibility to pleasure, as exemplified by the cowherds on Achilles’ shield who “take pleasure in their *syringes*” (*Il.* 18.526), has a double and ironic relationship to their likeness to poets, since it may lead to neglect of their herding duties while it is also an essential component of good poetry. By this logic, the truth and falsehood of the songs that the Muses will teach Hesiod should also have some equivalent in herding activity. The ἀληθέα of the Muses, which means not just “true things” but etymologically “things not forgotten”, refers to their preservation of knowledge and traditional wisdom, and this corresponds to the herdsman’s task to guard and preserve his animals. On the other hand, the veristic ψεύδεα spoken by the Muses are apparently not simply “lies”, but imaginative creations, fictions, that contribute to the delight of the audience in song,²¹ and they correspond to the herdsman’s ability to charm and persuade, both his animals and other herdsmen. A connection between falsehood, music, and deceptive herding practices appears also in the *Iliad*, when Priam grieves the loss of Hector by excoriating his remaining sons as liars, dilettantes, and dishonest herdsmen who rob their own kinsmen (*Il.* 24.260–262):

τοὺς μὲν ἀπώλεσ' Ἄρης, τὰ δ' ἐλέγχεα πάντα λέλειπται
 ψεύσται τ' ὀρχησται τε χοροῖτυπῆσιν ἄριστοι
 ἄρνων ἢ δ' ἐρίφων ἐπιδήμιοι ἀρπακτῆρες.

Ares destroyed the others, but all the reproaches remain, the liars and dancers, those best at thumping the dance floor, the snatchers of lambs and kids belonging to their own people.

²⁰ Cf. Σ *Theog.* 26 οἶονεῖ ἀντὶ τοῦ περὶ τὴν γαστέρα μόνην ἀσχολούμενοι καὶ μόνα τὰ τῆς γαστρὸς φρονεῖντες, “it refers to those concerned with just the belly and having thoughts only of the belly”; for parallel passages, see West (1966), note to the same line.

²¹ *Theog.* 27–28 has received extensive discussion by scholars, although the importance of the address to herdsmen is usually ignored; for a recent reading, see Clay (2003) 58–64, who argues that the Muses offer to teach Hesiod how to sing both truth and deceiving falsehood.

The son that Priam has in mind most particularly is clearly the former cowherd Paris, who rejected the offers of kingly rule and military glory made by Hera and Athena in favor of Aphrodite's offer of a beautiful woman, the lure of pleasure to which herdsmen as "pure bellies" are, in this cultural paradigm, particularly susceptible.

The narrative type concerning the herdsman who has a divine encounter and so becomes a poet or sage is documented for other figures as well: Archilochus, to whom the Muses gave a lyre for a cow (*SEG* 15.517 = T 3 Gerber), Epimenides, who became a sage and wonderworker after falling asleep for fifty-seven years when looking for a lost sheep (Diogenes Laert. 1.109), and the young Branchus, who was given seership and founded the oracle at Didymus after Apollo seduced him as he was tending sheep (Callimachus fr. 229 Pf.). Yet Hesiod's encounter with the Muses on Helicon became the primary model for later symbolic accounts of initiation in poetic texts. In a lost section of the prologue to the *Aetia*, Callimachus claimed that as a young man he dreamed he was transported to Helicon where he learned about local customs by querying the Muses, and an explicit comparison with Hesiod pasturing his sheep by Hippocrene (fr. 2 Pf. = 4 M.) survives from this section of the poem.²² Theocritus' use of the Hesiodic passage is just as unmistakable, though reworked to suit his focus on herdsmen in their own right. In *Id.* 7 the staff has become the herdsman's crook and, though still the Muses' gift, it is now handed over by the Coan goatherd Lycidas, who embodies the best of bucolic singing.²³ When Lycidas acknowledges the clever irony of Simichidas' modesty by claiming that he is "all fictioned for truth" (πᾶν ἐπ' ἀλαθείᾳ πεπλασμένον, *Id.* 7.44), he repackages the Muses' declaration that they speak "many falsehoods like the truth" (ψευδέα πολλά ... ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα, *Theog.* 27), in language that further confounds the dichotomy of truth and falsehood, or real-

²² For discussion of the dream episode and the possible inclusion of references to the waters on Helicon, see Massimilla (1996) 233–237.

²³ Because of the resemblance between this meeting and accounts of divine encounters, many have argued that Lycidas stands for a divine figure; see, for instance, Luck (1966); Lawall (1967) 80–82, who argues for a satyr; Williams (1971), who prefers Apollo; Brown (1981), who advances Pan. Taking a different approach, Bowie (1985) conjectures that Lycidas originated as a character in the poetry of Philitas. But another important model is Odysseus' encounter with the goatherd Melanthius in *Od.* 17.182–261; on which, see Ott (1972) 146–148, Halperin (1983a) 224–227, Hunter (1999) 147–148; privileging that model, I prefer to take Theocritus at his word that Lycidas is a simple goatherd.

ity and fiction.²⁴ In imitation of the Heliconian Hippocrene, Simichidas first mentions a Coan spring called Bourina, produced by a mythical ancestor of the poet's hosts (*Id.* 7.6–9), and later describes the intoxicating effect of the local wine he drinks mixed with water from a spring on their estate (7.147–155). Since Philitas had mentioned the Bourina spring in a lost poem (fr. 6 Spanoudakis = 11 Sbardella), we probably have evidence for another literary text that was part of the chain of allusions contributing to Theocritus' bucolic imagery.²⁵ Likewise, in *Ecl.* 6 Virgil recounts the poetic initiation of his friend Gallus, the elegiac love poet, who also met the Muses on Helicon near the Permessus;²⁶ Linus, a mythical singer worshiped on Helicon (Pausanias 9.29.6), now plays the Lycidas role and presents Gallus with the pipes that the Muses once gave to Hesiod (*Ecl.* 6.64–73). As shown by these and other passages, Hesiod's encounter with the Muses while tending his family's flock became the foundation story in Greek culture for what it meant to become a poet, and the logic of this symbolic narrative is inextricably tied up with the traditional association of herding activities with knowledge and persuasion.

Surely, ancient herdsmen, like modern ones, sometimes used song to circumvent boredom in the pasture and to establish social status through agonistic displays. But they also practiced singing and *syrinx* playing as an essential part of their herding duties, to establish order in the pasture by guiding animals gently through sound rather than violently with blows. In Euripides' *Helen* the chorus compares birds following their leader in flight formation to the sheep "persuaded by the shepherd's pipe" (ll. 1482–1484; cf. Xenophon, *Cyr.* 1.1.2), and Plato (*Plt.* 268b) points out that herdsmen soothe and calm their animals by charming them with both instrumental music and voice (cf. Plato, *Ion* 540c).²⁷ In Euripides' *Alcestis* Apollo, serving as herdsman for Adme-

²⁴ Cf. Longus 4.20.1, where a herdsman is told "to tell the truth and not make up things that are like myths" (τἀληθῆ λέγειν μὴδὲ ὅμοια πλάττειν μύθοις); Longus' phrasing here produces intertextual references to both Hesiod and Theocritus, though returning to the traditional distinction.

²⁵ For the similarity between Bourina and Hippocrene, see Krevans (1983) 209–212, Hunter (1999) on *Id.* 7.6, and for the possibility that Bourina is to be understood as the spring on the estate of Simichidas' hosts, see Puelma (1960) 162–163, n. 58, Sbardella (2000) 169–178.

²⁶ Another such initiation by the Permessus in Prop. 2.10.16; for additional references, see West (1966) on *Theog.* 26.

²⁷ This association of orderly behavior with musical sound is also reflected in the Greek vocabulary from the root *nem-, since νόμος means not only "custom/law" but

tus, plays herding songs for the flocks and the charm of his music is so great that even wild beasts are “shepherded together with joy at the song” (579). It is the herdsman’s ability to establish order in the natural world, especially through musical sound, that makes him a good candidate to become a singer of cosmogonies, like Hesiod. For this reason, mythical singers with extraordinary power over nature, such as Orpheus and Amphion, became associated with herdsmen—through simile, through narrative, and in pastoral poetry itself. In Apollonius, for instance, Orpheus quiets a nascent quarrel among the Argonauts by charming them with a song about the creation of the universe and battles among the gods (*Arg.* 1.494–515). The parallel with the herdsman is made clear a few lines later when Orpheus, charming fish with his lyre, is compared to a shepherd, enticing his sheep to their stead by playing a “rustic song” on his “shrill *syrix*” (*Arg.* 1.569–579).²⁸ In the cosmogonical and mythical song of Silenus in *Ecl.* 6, Hesiod too is said to have “charmed the rigid ashtrees on the mountains” with his singing and piping (6.70–71). Servius’ allegorical interpretation of the poem, in which Silenus represents the Epicurean philosopher Siro (*ad Buc.* 6.13), shows clearly that ancient readers recognized the similarity of musical herdsmen who established order in the pasture to the early poets and later philosophers who sought to systematize understanding of the universe. If Theocritus is less directly concerned with likening his herdsman to purveyors of knowledge, his mythical Daphnis nonetheless fits the model of a singer with power over nature, since he can entice his calves to dance (*Id.* 6.45) and foresees his own death as the end of order in the natural world (*Id.* 1.132–136).

As an instrument of persuasion, the *syrix* has the capacity to charm for the pleasure of the audience and also to delude, to the detriment of either the piper or his audience. In Greek thought, and surely in actual practice, the negative side to the herdsman’s duty to guard was

also “song”, in the sense of sounds arranged in a harmonious structure. Cf. Ps.-Archytas (apud Stob. 4.1.138) νομεὺς ὁ διανέμων τὰς τροφὰς τοῖς οἰεσσιν· καὶ τὰ τῶν κυθαφδῶν δὲ ῥήματα νόμοι συντάσσοντι γὰρ καὶ ταῦτα τὰν ψυχάν, ἁρμονία καὶ ῥυθμοῖς καὶ μέτροις ἀειδόμενα, “we call *nomeus* he who distributes their food to the sheep; that is why we call the verses sung by the lyre players *nomoi*, for these verses impart order to the soul because they are sung according to the laws of harmony, rhythm, and measure” (trans. by Guthrie (1987) 192–193).

²⁸ Orpheus does not appear in Theocritus, but he becomes an important mythical prototype for Bion in the *Epitaph for Bion* 18, 116–125, as well as for Virgil’s herdsmen/singers, especially the more ambitious ones (see *Ecl.* 3.46, 4.55–57, 6.30, 8.55–56).

his capacity to inattention, with resulting danger to his animals and himself. Writing from a practical perspective, Columella warns that the herdsman must be constantly vigilant so that neither thief nor predatory animal cheat him while he is “daydreaming” (*hallucinantem*, 7.3.26). At the same time, the animal thief was often a herdsman himself, whose supplementation of his own herd at the expense of less clever herdsmen would increase his status in the community.²⁹ So, for instance, Hermes, the god of thieves as well as rhetorical persuasion, gains a position of honor among the gods by cleverly purloining the cattle of Apollo, and then celebrates his acceptance into the Olympian family by inventing the *syrix* (*HHom.Hermes* 511–512).³⁰ Elsewhere, the *syrix* becomes the instrument of choice in animal theft. In Longus’ pastoral novel, a young herdsman uses the charm of his *syrix* to “cowherd away” (ἀπεβουκόλησεν, 1.27.3) the best cows belonging to a herd tended by a maiden. Similarly, in Ovid’s version of the myth of Io (*Met.* 1.668–688, 713–723) and apparently in earlier Greek versions as well (e.g., Bacchylides, *Dith.* 19.35–36), Hermes, after lulling Argus to sleep with his *syrix*, kills him and takes away the heifer put in his charge. The hundred-eyed Argus, sometimes known as Panoptes, “all-seeing one”, was given the task of guarding Io because he was the best of all possible cowherds, the master watcher, who yet offered no match for the intoxicating music of Hermes, cattle thief and master of persuasion. This old association of theft with the agonistic use of music appears in Theocritus’ *Id.* 5, where Comatas and Lacon initially exchange accusations of theft (of a fleece and a *syrix*) before engaging in a singing match that establishes Comatas as the more clever singer, and also in Virgil’s *Ecl.* 3, where accusations of theft again lead directly to a singing match (ll. 5–6, 16–20).

The tension between the real-life herdsman, who was uneducated and lived a life of hard work, and the emblematic or mythical herdsman, who held the wisdom of the ages and lived a life of pleasant leisure, was explored in Euripides’ lost *Antiope*. This famous play about how the twins Amphion and Zethus came to build the walls of Thebes,

²⁹ See, for instance, Aristot. *Plt.* 1.3.5 (1256b), where it is pointed out that the pastoral life and the life of brigandage are often combined.

³⁰ The verb βουκόλειν means not only “herd cows” or just “herd” but also “soothe” (e.g., Aesch. *Eum.* 78) and “deceive” (e.g., Men. *Sam.* 530, 596). Since all the literal and transferred meanings were active before the 3rd century BC, Theocritus’ use of “bucolic terminology” surely evoked for his earliest readers the “soothing/deceiving” activity appropriate both to herdsmen and poets.

was one of a series of tragedies, all now fragmentary, in which young men born to noble families were exposed after birth and then reared by herdsmen, only to discover their true identities in the course of the drama. The theme was so often treated that a goatherd in Menander's *Epitrepontes* cites such a plot to explain the possible familial circumstances of his own foundling (ll. 325–333):

You have seen tragedies, I know, and you remember all these things. An old goatherd wearing a cloak like mine has found some Neleus and Pelias. And when he has come to recognize that they are superior to himself, he tells what happened, how he found and adopted them. He gives them a little pouch of tokens, from which they learn everything about themselves and become kings, those who had formerly been goatherds.

The goatherd here summarizes the plot of a *Tyro*, two versions of which were produced by Sophocles, and a similar story pattern appeared in Sophocles' *Alexander* (about Paris) and in Euripides' *Melanippe Desmotis* (about Boeotus and Aeolus) and his *Alexander*, in addition to *Antiope*. All these plays seem, to some extent, to have used the paradox of the herdsman who is actually a king to explore sophistic ideas about the equality of human beings regardless of social class. So typically the young men, sometimes twins as in the Romulus and Remus version, prove themselves physically, mentally, or morally superior to their royal enemies before being revealed as nobly born.³¹ In the *Alexander*, for instance, Paris, while thought to be merely a cowherd, defeats his brothers Hector and Deiphobus in athletic contests, showing, with typical Euripidean irony, the natural superiority of the rustic over the aristocrat.³² These plays represent an important stage toward the development of pastoral as a genre because in them herdsmen appear, and positively, as major characters, even if their low status dissolves during the tragic denouement. In Theocritus' *Id.* 4 the motif of the herdsman who goes off to compete in athletic contests seems to have been taken from Euripides' *Alexander*, and Longus finds an ending for his pastoral novel in the story pattern familiar from tragedy and New Comedy, when Daphnis and Chloe turn out to be foundlings born to wealthy parents.

But the *Antiope* explored not only the social analogy of the herdsman to members of the ruling class but also the intellectual one of the

³¹ See Gutzwiller (1991) 51–59. The story of Cyrus' upbringing, related by Herod. 1.108–116, follows the same pattern.

³² As argued, apparently, by the chorus of herdsmen: *TrGF* (3)F61b and c.

herdsman as poet, philosopher, or rhetorician. In this play Zethus and Amphion, twins of royal blood exposed at birth and reared by herdsmen, find again their mother Antiope, rescue her from the torments of the Theban queen Dirce, and then construct the walls of Thebes at the command of Hermes.³³ But the most memorable scene, the one that made the play famous, was a debate between the brothers about the value of the practical life devoted to hard work versus the contemplative life devoted to leisure and the pleasures of the intellect. The debate was prompted, it seems, by Amphion's persistent playing of a lyre that had been given to him by Hermes (the one he invented after the theft of Apollo's cattle) and with which he sang about the nature of the universe from a rationalistic perspective (*TrGF* (12)F182a).³⁴ The discussion was apparently witnessed by their foster father, a cowherd, and it seems that in the end, on the old cowherd's request, Amphion yielded to Zethus.³⁵ If this reconstruction is correct, then the *Antiope* provided a literary model, in the form of a tragic *agon*, for singing contests between herdsmen judged by another rustic, as found in the pastorals of the Theocritean corpus and Virgil (*Id.* 5, ps.-Theocritus' *Id.* 8 and 9, *Ecl.* 3, 7, and 8).

The debate itself also anticipates the themes and values of bucolic poetry. Zethus, who accused Amphion of "neglecting" his duties as a countryman (paraphrased in Plato's *Gorgias* as ἀμελείς ... ὃν δεῖ σε ἐπιμελείσθαι, 485c = *TrGF* (12)F185.1), argued for a life devoted to "digging, plowing the earth, and tending herds" (*TrGF* (12)F188.4) and opposed Amphion's preoccupation with music, which he characterized as a form of sophistic laziness. Amphion, on the other hand, argued that the intellectual was in reality a more effective citizen than the man who engaged in war or other active professions. Since life was neither entirely fortunate nor entirely unfortunate, the wisest course, he claims, is to live "pleasantly inactive" (ζῆν ἡδέως ἀπράγμονα, *TrGF* (12)F193.2), "avoiding pain as pleasantly as possible" (ὥς ἥδιστα μὴ λυπούμενοι, *TrGF* (12)F196.5). Although it is not clear how the positions taken by Zethus and Amphion worked themselves out in the dramatic action, their arguments acquired an independent afterlife. In Plato's *Gorgias*

³³ The plot is preserved in Hygin. *Fab.* 8; for reconstruction of the play and discussion, see Snell (1964) 70–98, Webster (1967) 205–211, and Kambitsis (1972).

³⁴ On the rationalistic character of Hermes's song compare Eurip. *TrGF* (78)F839.

³⁵ The presence of the old cowherd as an arbiter for the debate is revealed by a representation on a "Homeric bowl", as noted by Hausmann (1958) 63–64, and Amphion's yielding to Zethus is suggested by Hor. *Epist.* 1.18.41–44.

(484c–86d), most importantly, Callicles paraphrases Zethus' arguments to criticize Socrates (who thus plays the Amphion role) of continuing to philosophize even in his mature years when he should be engaging in political or economic pursuits.³⁶ The themes of the debate between the cowherd brothers lived on as well in later bucolic poetry. The idea of herdsman's song as a diversion from duty, one that is yet pleasant and valuable, underlies such idealized pastoral scenes as that in Theocritus' *Id.* 1, where the goatherd's cup contains the emblematic contrast between an old fisherman using all his strength in his labor and a boy who fails to guard a vineyard because he is so pleasantly absorbed in plaiting a cricket cage.³⁷ Later still, in a fragment of Bion (fr. 8 Gow = Reed), we find an argument for the pleasant life devoted to song, in opposition to a life of work and striving after wealth, which is remarkably similar to Amphion's position in the *Antiope*.³⁸

As Amphion represented the herdsman/poet from the tragic perspective as one of those "better than ourselves", the Cyclops came to represent the herdsman/poet from the comic perspective as one of those "worse than ourselves". The Homeric Polyphemus often functioned in 5th-cent. anthropological thought as an emblem of the natural life without the restraints of *nomos*. In the traditional Homeric account, he also exhibits the herdsman's susceptibility to pleasure and inattention, as he is made drunk by strong wine and deceived by Odysseus, who steals his flocks as well as his sight. Euripides' *Cyclops* is one of several known satyr plays (the only one surviving in its entirety) in which the satyrs take on the role of herdsmen, and the satyric ambience of dramatic herding scenes seems to have influenced later pastoral in a number of ways.³⁹ The Polyphemus of Euripides' play retains the savage character of Homer's Cyclops, but now he has erotic propensities

³⁶ See Slings (1991), who examines how Socrates relates to Amphion as both poet and politician.

³⁷ Perhaps not by accident, the same dichotomy between hard work and the enchanting pleasure of artistic activity appears in Apollonius' description of the brothers constructing the Theban walls as depicted on Jason's cloak (*Arg.* 1.735–741). There Zethus, "like to one toiling hard" (μογέοντι βουκόως, 1.739; cf. Theocr. *Id.* 1.41, κάμινοντι τὸ κατ'εργὸν ἀνδρὶ βουκόως, of the old fisherman), lifts a gigantic boulder while Amphion moves one twice as large simply by singing to "his golden lyre".

³⁸ Cf. Virg. *Ecl.* 2.23–24, where Corydon claims to sing all the songs performed by "Dircaean Amphion".

³⁹ For instance, the goatherd in *Id.* 3 has satyric features, on which see Gutzwiller (1991) 118, and as Servius tells us (on *Ecl.* 6.14), the boys Chromis and Mnasyllus who bind Silenus in *Ecl.* 6 are understood by some to be satyrs.

(*Cycl.* 581–587) and, after consuming Odysseus' wine, sings "unmusically" (ἄμουσος, l. 425). The literary work that had the most important influence on the later pastoral Cyclops was, however, a lost dithyramb produced by Philoxenus in the years before 388 BC, the date at which it was the subject of parody in Aristophanes' *Plutus*. In Philoxenus' dithyramb the story of Odysseus' capture was combined, seemingly for the first time,⁴⁰ with the motif of Polyphemus' love for the sea nymph Galatea. Ancient sources claim that Philoxenus' dithyramb satirized Dionysius I, tyrant of Syracuse, and the Sicilian connection likely explains, in part, Theocritus' interest in revisiting motifs developed in a dithyramb performed at Athens. Philoxenus, who served as court poet for a while at Syracuse, is reported to have been imprisoned by Dionysius, either because he spoke too frankly about the quality of the tyrant's own verse compositions (Diodorus Siculus 15.6) or because he tried to seduce Dionysius' mistress Galatea (Phaenias fr. 13 Wehrli = *PMG* 816).⁴¹ Although the anecdotal tradition may have originated in later 4th-cent. comedies that revisited the Cyclops-Galatea theme,⁴² the stories nonetheless show that Polyphemus was viewed as a comic version of the poet, because he was inherently "unmusical".

Philoxenus brought Polyphemus on stage playing a cithara to guide his sheep (Σ Aristoph. *Plut.* 290 = *PMG* 819), and his cithara playing was either an example of the new music that produced nontraditional sounds or, perhaps, parody of it.⁴³ We also have the beginning of a song

⁴⁰ See, however, Anello (1984), who argues for an old Sicilian tradition linking Polyphemus and Galatea.

⁴¹ For fuller discussion of the sources, see Hordern (1999), who argues that the Galatea motif was probably only a minor part of the dithyramb. Duris of Samos (Σ Theocr. *Id.* 6 arg. f = *FGHist* 76F58) offers a different explanation for the origin of the story, namely that Polyphemus had built a shrine to Galatea because of the fertility of his pastures and the abundance of milk and that Philoxenus, not understanding its origin, had invented the story of the Cyclops' love for the nymph.

⁴² As suggested by Webster (1970) 20–21, but Hordern (1999) 445–450 argues that the dithyramb was satirical from the beginning. The known plays on this subject are Nicochares' *Galatea* (*PCG* 3–6), Antiphanes' *Cyclops* (*PCG* 129–131), and Alexis' *Galatea* (*PCG* 37–40); see Arnott (1996) 139–141.

⁴³ For these possibilities, see Gutzwiller (1991) 63–64. For the new character of the Athenian dithyramb, which mixed generic forms and featured sound over sense, see Barker (1984) 93–98, Gentili (1988) 26–31, Comotti (1989) 31–32, 35–40, West (1992) 356–372, and Csapo (2004). The new music was criticized by Plato (and others) on the basis that it promoted lawlessness in society and appealed to the worst aspects of democracy. In *Leg.* 700d–701b, where the equation of music and order in society is made especially clear, he claims that contemporary dithyrambists are themselves "overcome by pleasure" and compose in order to please each member of their audi-

that he sang in praise of Galatea's beauty (Athenaeus 13.564e = *PMG* 821), and this must have been the model for the song he sings in *Id.* 11, later reworked by Virgil as Corydon's song about his love for Alexis in *Ecl.* 2. Also in the dithyramb, according to a paraphrase by Synesius (*Epist.* 121 = *PMG* 818), Odysseus attempted to persuade the Cyclops to release him by claiming that, as a magician, he could enchant the elusive Galatea with love charms: "I will present her here drawn (ἀγώγμῳ) to you by many love charms (πολλαῖς ἑυγῆι); she will beg and entreat you, and you are to pretend indifference as if you don't love her".⁴⁴ But Odysseus failed to convince the Cyclops, and the blinding was either part of the performance or was foreshadowed in it. The idea of a reversal in the erotic relationship of Polyphemus and Galatea appealed to Theocritus and was reworked in his bucolic poetry. Toward the end of his song in *Id.* 11, Polyphemus claims that he will find another Galatea among the girls who giggle and beg him to play with them (11.76–79); his feigned indifference to Galatea here is a remembrance of Odysseus' advice in the dithyramb. In addition, in *Id.* 6 the songs exchanged by Daphnis and Damoetas work out the fantasies that Odysseus seeks to impose on Philoxenus' Cyclops. There Daphnis' vision of Galatea's flirting with Polyphemus by pelting his flock with apples develops the implications of Odysseus' promise to bewitch the nymph until she begs for the Cyclops' love, while Polyphemus' coy pretense to be disinterested is likewise in accord with Odysseus' instructions on how to stimulate Galatea's desires (κατειρωνεύσῃ, "pretend not to love her").⁴⁵

The opening of *Id.* 11, in which Theocritus tells his friend Nicias that there is no better *pharmakon* for love than the Muses, is expressly connected with Philoxenus by the bucolic scholiasts, who report that in the dithyramb Polyphemus soothed himself with song and sent dolphins to tell Galatea that he was curing himself of love (*ad Id.* 11.1–

ence whether they know good music or not. For the relationship between 4th-cent. dithyramb and the Hellenistic system of poetics, see Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 18–21.

⁴⁴ Synesius does not name Philoxenus as his source, but scholars have generally accepted Bergk's suggestion that he is paraphrasing the dithyramb. Odysseus here uses the standard language referring to the *agoge* spell, which was designed to draw women from their homes often with use of the *iunx*; see Faraone (1999) 55–69; at the same time, Odysseus here plays the sophist, promising magical results from his rhetorical expertise (on rhetoric as a magic spell, see Gorgias, *VS* 82B11.10).

⁴⁵ This discussion of the Cyclops' pretended indifference and the influence of Philoxenus has been developed independently by Fantuzzi (2004).

3b). Polyphemus' self-therapy for love through song reflects the traditional task of the herdsman to soothe and control his animals through music, here reworked as self-directed persuasion, or delusion (οὕτω τοι Πολύφαιμος ἐποίμαινεν τὸν ἔρωτα / μουσίσδων, "thus did Polyphemus shepherd his love by singing", *Id.* 11.80–81), and as such it became a popular image for the uses of poetry in the early Hellenistic age. In Theocritus' comic, surely ironic parallel of the poet to this "lovesick goatherd" (δυσέρωτα ... αἰπόλον, *Id.* 6.7; echoed by Posidippus 19.8 Austin-Bastianini), the brutish, uncivilized Cyclops is remade as the learned poet, whose knowledge and poetic skill are focused on harnessing and taming his passions. In a poetic response to *Id.* 11, again quoted by the scholiasts (*ad Id.* 11, *arg.* c), Nicias agreed with Theocritus' statement about love as a *pharmakon*, by stating the "Eros has taught many poets who were before unmusical" (οἱ γὰρ Ἔρωτες / ποιητὰς πολλοὺς ἐδίδασξαν τὸ πρὶν ἀμούσους), and Callimachus also offered the "not unlearned" (οὐκ ἀμαθής) Polyphemus, who "discovered the charm against love" (τὰν ἐπαιοιδὰν / τῶραμένῳ), as the paradigm for his own erotic struggles (*AP* 12.150 = *HE* 1047ff.).⁴⁶ In *Id.* 7 as well, where the sophisticated and rustic poets exchange bucolic songs, the goal for both singers seems to be the achievement of emotional calm, as Lycidas seeks to soothe his passionate longing for Ageanax and Simichidas hopes to bring "serenity" (ἄσυχία, 7.126) to his lovelorn friend Aratus. Because there was a well-established tradition in Greek thought of the herdsman representing the poet, both as purveyor of wisdom and as producer of soothing pleasure, Theocritus' herdsmen, in their more tragic form like Daphnis and their comic form like the Cyclops, could reflect the new ideas of the Hellenistic period about how the poet should use verse to represent his own scholarly endeavors in connection with his personal emotional life.

As we have seen, from at least the time of Hesiod the herdsman as a singer/piper was associated not only with preservation of knowledge, or *didaskalia*, but also with pleasure and sweet illusion, qualities that by the Hellenistic age were identified by the term *psychagogia*. When Simichidas claims that while cowherding on the mountains he was "taught" (δίδαξαν, *Id.* 7.92) by the Nymphs, here standing in for the Muses, he is clearly reworking the Hesiodic initiation, though the substitu-

⁴⁶ Callimachus' language is probably an echo of Philoxenus (perhaps filtered through the intermediary of Theocritus' treatment of the Cyclops), since Synesius, *Epist.* 121 uses similar magic phraseology (ἐπὶ δὲ ... καὶ καταδέσμονες καὶ ἐρωτικὰς κατανάγκας).

tion of βουκολέοντα for Hesiod's ἄρνας ποιμαίνονθ' (*Theog.* 23), which signals his interest in what was likely a Sicilian tradition of "bucolic" singing. The initiation scene is, however, incomplete until he meets the goatherd Lycidas, who is the one to give him a gift from the Muses, but now a simple herdsman's staff instead of the scepter awarded Hesiod. Only then, it seems, does he become capable of understanding the sensual charm offered at the Thalyssia celebration and of benefiting from the intoxicating mix of wine and water consumed there, a concluding allusion to the Hesiodic references to the Heliconian streams through the intertextual filter of other Hellenistic initiation scenes now lost to us.⁴⁷ In Plato's *Phaedrus* Socrates objects to the enchantment cast by the nymphs of the *locus amoenus* by the Ilissus stream, which he equals with the persuasive and potentially deluding effect of rhetoric (called ψυχαγωγία τις διὰ λόγων, 261a), by claiming that it distracts him from the philosophical search for the truth. But Theocritus in his herding poetry values differently the ἡδονή of an enchanting grove at noon (cf. the programmatic ἄδύ τι ... ἄδύ δέ of *Id.* 1.1–2) and seems to suggest that the sweetness of sound, especially as a comfort for love's pain, is an appropriate and sufficient goal for the poet. If later bucolic poets assert themselves as *didaskaloi* (*Epitaph for Bion* 83; Bion fr. 10 Gow = Reed), it is nevertheless in the context of teaching their audience how to avoid or soothe erotic discomfort. Theocritus and his bucolic followers seem, then, to ascribe to contemporary theories prilinging *psychagogia*, as opposed to *didaskalia*, as the goal of poetry.⁴⁸ When Virgil supplements his *merae rusticae* with topics of greater scope, including predictions of a coming golden age in *Ecl.* 4 and a physical and mythical history of the universe in *Ecl.* 6, he is not inventing new topics suitable for a herdsman to sing but exploring the Greek tradition of the herdsman/poet in ways that Theocritus played down, in favor of focus on the more personal, emotional lives of herdsmen.

⁴⁷ Most likely, a lost poem by Philitas (cf. Prop. 3.3.52 *Philitea ... aqua*); in addition, Callimachus may have drunk from the waters on Helicon in the "Somnium" in *Aetia* 1.

⁴⁸ Eratosthenes expressly argued that entertainment, or *psychagogia*, rather than instruction, or *didaskalia*, was the proper goal of poetry (Strabo 1.1.10, 1.2.3).

BUCOLIC SINGERS OF THE SHORT SONG:
LYRIC AND ELEGIAC RESONANCES
IN THEOCRITUS' BUCOLIC *IDYLLS*

BENJAMIN ACOSTA-HUGHES

"This little tune I worked out lately on
the mountainside ..."

—Theocr. 7.51

1. *A song sung (and recalled)*

Hellenistic poetry's engagement with the short songs of the earlier lyric and elegiac traditions is a typically multi-faceted one; the later period's reception of song encompasses preservation and reading, collection and comparison. Further, it necessarily contextualizes the individual song recalled through evocation of its earlier singer(s), and through artistic recreation in a new setting, and so frequently creates in the mind of a later audience the occasion of an earlier song's singing; in this respect Hellenistic reception is often simultaneously analytic and mimetic. In the same song settings later voices perform and earlier voices sing again.

A revealing example of this process is the opening motto of one of Theocritus' Aeolic poems, *Id.* 29.1: "Οἶνος, ὃ φίλε παῖ", λέγεται, "καὶ ἀλάθρα". The motto, from a poem of Alcaeus now no longer extant,¹ serves as the springboard for the later poet's reading of the motto,² and as the pretext for Theocritus' own Aeolic symposiastic/erotic composition, his poem's mimetic rendering of the original singing of these words.

¹ Plato cites this line earlier at *Symp.* 217e3–4 τὸ λεγόμενον, οἶνος ἄνευ τε παίδων καὶ μετὰ παίδων ἦν ἀληθής "as the saying goes, wine without boys and with boys is truthful", where the scholiast assigns the proverb to Alcaeus. An interesting question arises here as to whether Theocritus is evoking only Alcaeus here, or Plato's invocation of Alcaeus in the *Symposium*, a text which he is clearly recalling in the opening of *Id.* 13.

² Cavarzere (1996) 19–20: "la sua presenza [sc. of the motto] nell'arte alessandrina non meraviglia certo, quando si rifletta che proprio in questo periodo giunge a per-

“Οἶνος, ὦ φίλε παῖ”, λέγεται, “καὶ ἀλάθεα”:
 καῖμιε χορὴ μεθύοντας ἀλάθεας ἔμμεναι.
 καῖγω μὲν τὰ φρένων ἐρέω κέατ’ ἐν μύχῳ·
 οὐκ ὅλας φιλήν μ’ ἐθέλῃσθ’ ἀπὸ καρδίας.

“Wine, dear boy”, it is said, “and truth”. And we too, as we drink deep, should be truthful. And I will say what lies inmost in my mind. You are not willing to love me with your whole heart.

The inscription here is highlighted by the development of each image in the following lines. οἶνος, “wine”, morphs into μεθύοντας “drinking deep”, the noun of the motto now transformed into verbal action, as the image of past symposium is transferred to the present one.³ ἀλάθεα, “truth”, in the motto is transformed into ἀλάθεας, “truthful”, in the first line of the responding poem, maintaining the sound, number of syllables, and also position of elements of the motto.⁴ φίλε, “dear” in the motto recurs in the infinitive φιλήν, “to love” of l. 4 in a rather ingenious way. For the unrequited love that is the subject of the later poem’s speaker is mirrored in the transference of the adjective φίλε, applied to the boy in the motto, to the verbal action *not* applied on the boy’s part to the speaker of *Id.* 29. A φίλος παῖς is, in this sense, exactly what the singer of *Id.* 29 does not have. Finally, and strikingly,

fetto compimento la trasformazione del messaggio poetico da orale a scritto, quando addirittura la precedente poesia orale riceve dai filologi alessandrini una sistemazione scritta in edizioni destinate a rimanere canoniche ... L’allusività, nella quale rientra appunto anche il procedimento del ‘motto’ iniziale, è la necessaria attitudine al dialogo d’una siffatta poesia, che può finalmente contare su un pubblico di lettori in grado di riconoscere con tutto comodo l’allusione, di assorbirla e di pensarci su”.

³ While there is nothing very unusual about the use of μεθύω, “to be drunk”, here, it may be worth keeping in mind that Alcaeus appears to have been an author treated in Chamaeleon’s Περί μέθης, “On intoxication”. Theocritus uses the verb in one other context, *Id.* 22.98–99 ἔστι δὲ πληγαῖς μεθύων, ἐκ δ’ ἔπτυσεν αἷμα / φοίνιον, “he stood punch-drunk with blows, and spat out red blood”. See further Gow (1952) vol. 2, 396; Sens (1997) 145–146. Anacreon’s metaphorical use of this verb in the phrase μεθύων ἔρωτι (*PMG* 376.2, cited by Hephaestion among others) is intriguing here; it is not impossible that Theocritus is evoking *both* senses of μεθύω, and both earlier poets. μεθύω is certainly a verb that is characteristic both of Alcaeus’ poetry and the tradition(s) about him (e.g. Chamaeleon); cf. fr. 58.12. Voigt ἵμοι μεθύων ἀείσης, “drunk may you sing”; fr. 332.1–2 V. νῦν χορὴ μεθύσθην καὶ τινα πρὸς βίαν / πώνην, “now must we get drunk, and drink with all our might”; fr. 335.3–4 V. φάρμακον δ’ ἄριστον / οἶνον ἐνεκαμένους μεθύσθην, “the best remedy is for those who’ve brought wine to get drunk”.

⁴ On the form ἀλαθέας see Gow (1952) vol. 2, 61. The form, as Gow notes, is not commonly used of persons; the variation of both nouns of the Alcaic motto with adjectival forms is one of the striking features of the motto’s re-working.

λέγεται, not, surely, a component of the Alcaic original, but apparently part of the ‘tradition’ of this motto, recurs in ἐρέω: the perfective form λέγεται, “it is said” of the traditional *Spruchwort* is now evolved into the future declarative utterance ἐρέω, “I will say”.⁵ Of the six elements of the motto, excepting the vocative address ὦ, the single word παῖ, “boy” is the only element that does not recur in the lines that follow, but then the continued address to the παῖς of the Alcaic motto in Theocritus’ poem is itself the point of tangent of the two “poems”. Theocritus’ “Variations on a Theme by Alcaeus” takes up the same address, and his opening quotation at one and the same moment contextualizes the Alcaic motto and inscribes Theocritus into an Alcaic tradition. The simple parenthetical λέγεται becomes a significant marker here, as does the repeated καί that begins ll. 2 and 3, which at once aligns the later singer’s situation to the ethical content of the motto, and aligns the later with the earlier singer—there is great artistic and cultural valence in the simple “I also”. Further, this Alcaic motto opens a poem that is in a meter which had also been used by Alcaeus, but which is in particular the meter of the second book of the Alexandrian edition of Sappho. Though its name, “Sapphic fourteen-syllable pentameter”, is itself certainly of a later date, we can nonetheless assume this meter to have been already perceived in the Hellenistic age as associated distinctly with Sappho.⁶ The juxtaposition of this poem with the previous one, also in a meter of one of the books of Sappho, reveals something

⁵ Cf. τὸ λεγόμενον at Plato, *Symp.* 217e3; see further Cavarzere (1996) 53 n. 21, who notes that τὸ λεγόμενον at *Symp.* 217e particularly characterizes the citation from Alcaeus as a proverb. Commentators on Theocr. *Id.* 29 have wanted to include λέγεται in the original Alcaeus quote to finish the line (hence Lobel in his edition supported its inclusion; see further Gow (1952) vol. 2, 504; Voigt does not). Cavarzere ((1996) 53) makes the excellent point that 1) the poem need not be in the same meter as the motto inscribed at its opening and 2) that the verse of Alcaeus as we have it in the Plato scholia could be the beginning of an Aeolic pentameter, Aeolic hexameter, or even tetrameter. Alcaeus fr. 368 V. κέλομαι τινα τὸν χαρίεντα Μένωνα κάλεσσαι, / αἱ χρῆ συμποσίας ἐπόναντι ξμοιγε γένεσθαι, “I bid someone summon fair Menon, if I am to take pleasure in the symposium”, also a homoerotic symposiastic fragment, is in Aeolic hexameters. From a purely aesthetic point of view variation of meter could highlight a motto’s inscription just as could metrical similarity.

From another perspective, λέγεται can serve to mark the distance of original poetic utterance and repetition, and Gow’s comment ((1952) vol. 2, 504) that “T. seems to intend his poem to have at least the form of a scholion” and the parallel examples he cites from the *Theognidea* may be especially apt here.

⁶ Hephaestion 7.7, p. 23.14–17: τὸ μὲν πεντάμετρον καλεῖται Σαπφικὸν τεσσαρεσκαίδεκασύλλαβον, “the pentameter is called Sapphic of fourteen syllables”.

of Theocritus' reading of both Aeolic poets together.⁷ It is a complex act of poetic emulation that at once creates a tradition and valorizes a tradition's later voice.

The "poet" Simichidas, one of the two singers of *Id.* 7, similarly explicitly inscribes himself into song tradition (l. 37): καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ Μοισᾶν καπυρὸν στόμα, κῆμὲ λέγοντι / πάντες ἀοιδὸν ἄριστον, "I also am a clear-sounding voice of the Muses, and all name me the best singer". By referring to the Muses, rather than the more bucolic "nymphs",⁸ Simichidas evokes a larger comparison, as he arguably does with the use of the poetological καπυρός.⁹ Lycidas similarly inscribes himself into a poetic tradition, and might go further—again the καὶ in l. 50 κῆγ' ἔμην before the *aposiopesis* is key—when rather he offers the enigmatic gift I have used as epigraph for this paper, a "tune" (μελύδιον) that is "worked out" (ἐξεπόμενα), an artistic statement that may capture at once the seemingly impromptu and the compositionally refined, a statement emblematic of much of Theocritus and indeed of much of the poetry of his era.

Early in his groundbreaking study of Theocritus' non 'bucolic' poems, Richard Hunter acutely observed that scholarly (and reception) emphasis on one group of Theocritus' poems had obscured the *polyeideia* of the extant collection, a *polyeideia* that is more characteristic than not of Theocritus' contemporary artists.¹⁰ Inspired in part by Hunter's work with the presence of archaic voices in Theocritus' non-bucolic (or

⁷ B. Calabrese, "Theocritus Cleaved: Models for Reciprocal Love in *Idyll* 29" (forthcoming), a study of Theocritus' use of Sappho in this poem, suggests that the Alcaic motto and Sapphic meter of the opening line deliberately allude to Theocritus' use of both Aeolic poets. I am grateful for enlightening discussion with him on this point.

⁸ On the nymphs as validating voices of especially bucolic song see Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi-Hunter (2004) 151–156.

⁹ καπυρὸν γελάσας at Nossis *AP* 7.414 = *HE* 2827ff., an epitaph for the Syracusan Rhinthon, poet of *phlyakes*, is a quasi-contemporary parallel use of καπυρός that is often cited here, but deserves further consideration. The Nossis poem is largely about poetic self-definition, and of course Simichidas is doing just that here. Were Simichidas in fact recalling the Nossis epigram (and given that this is the closest parallel use of καπυρός, he well might be), there would then be a third figure of comparison in these lines along with Asclepiades and Philitas. On the Nossis epigram see Gutzwiller (1998) 84–85. Another Nossis epigram, *AP* 7.718 = *HE* 2831ff. may be in play at the opening of Lycidas' song (see below p. 37); it is tantalizing indeed to think that, in two songs that have a variety of contrasting models, a female epigrammatic voice may be one that they share in common, and in a particularly self-defining way.

¹⁰ Hunter (1996) 20: "the picture which emerges from the mists of our evidence is in fact a poet [sc. Asclepiades of Samos] whose range and interests prefigure those of Theocritus in important ways. Concentration upon Theocritus' 'bucolic' poems has tended

perhaps better phrased as ‘other than bucolic’) poems, it is my purpose in the following pages to look back specifically at the bucolic poems in terms of Theocritus’ compositional *polyeideia*, and to focus on one aspect of this compositional *polyeideia* in particular, the short song. Signaling some of Theocritus’ most imaginative appropriation of lyric and other archaic voices, the short song is also markedly different in these poems of Theocritus for its bucolic setting. Theocritus (or rather his individual singers) are effectively inscribing one song tradition into another, and at the same time, in an act of compositional mimesis, creating a bucolic ‘occasion’ for song.¹¹ This is particularly the case when the song of one of Theocritus’ singers in turn evokes an earlier song. As the majority of the lyric and elegiac songs of archaic Greek poetry that have survived have come down to us with no indication of their original occasion (although in some cases we can make a fair assessment as to what this performance occasion might have been), it is often possible, through Theocritus’ own acts of reception and contextual inscription, to then look back from a somewhat new and different angle at the archaic model; a reading of each enhances the other.

Appropriately, perhaps, for a poet for whom framing is so integral a compositional tool, I focus first on the way in which songs are inset into his bucolic poems, and then turn to the songs themselves.

2. *On singing songs*

The singers of Theocritus’ bucolic poems evoke a variety of song traditions;¹² a reading of these evocations is revealing both for how these are perceived as distinct from one another, and for the characterization of the singer. Thyrsis in *Id.* 1 casts himself, on actually initiating his song, as leader of the Muses in song. The build-up to this is gradual; it is not clear from the goatherd’s characterization at l. 19 τὰ Δάφνιδος ἄλγεα, “the suffering of Daphnis”, what sort of performance is envi-

to obscure the fact that the range and variety of his poems are very characteristic of the poetic milieu of the period, etc.”. See also Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 133.

¹¹ As poems which take on the appearance of oral compositions, the songs of Theocritus’ bucolic idylls in turn preserve moments of true oral poetry, as Pretagostini (1992) has demonstrated.

¹² Following Davies (1988a) I prefer not to distinguish across the board here between “choral” and “monodic” lyric poetry. My interest is in the short song. Where there appear to be marked “choral” features, as in *Id.* 1, I take note of these.

sioned, nor with l. 20 καὶ τᾶς βουκολικᾶς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεόν ἵκεο μοίσας, “you have arrived at the height of the bucolic muse”, is a distinction choral/monodic necessarily present, although some inscribed generic character is understood, at least by the speaker, with τᾶς βουκολικᾶς μοίσας.¹³ The line is a somewhat enigmatic one. ἐπὶ τὸ πλεόν meaning “to the height of” finds a parallel at *Id.* 3.47 ἐπὶ πλεόν ... λύσσας, but the sense in this line of *Id.* 1 then seems a bit peculiar, perhaps meant to mark the goatherd’s slightly naive enthusiasm. Slightly more problematic, I think, is the assumption, implicit in Gow’s translation of τᾶς βουκολικᾶς μοίσας as “pastoral song”, that this phrase is the equivalent of the βουκολικὰ αἰοιδά of Thyrsis’ refrain, or of Lycidas’ βουκολικὰ αἰοιδά at *Id.* 7.49. The metaphoric transference of Muse-poetry seems a bit sophisticated for the goatherd, and the marked recollection of the former line in the refrain seems so deliberately intended as such. Could something of a comparative in fact be understood at 1.19–20, and prefigure Thyrsis’ subsequent role of chorus director, the one who in fact commands the Muses?¹⁴ Thyrsis’ return in the *envoi* of ll. 144–145 to the more conventional role of celebrant in a way only emphasizes the novelty of his previous role.

It is, however, clear that Thyrsis has performed this song before, and in an agonistic setting.¹⁵ In that sense, a finished product of an earlier competition is “imported” into the bucolic setting of *Id.* 1: the song, as the goatherd’s cup, was earlier perfected elsewhere.¹⁶ With l. 61 τὸν ἐφίμερον ὕμνον ἀείσης, the audience’s expectations are led in the general direction of choral performance, but it is with the first instance of the

¹³ As Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi-Hunter (2004) 142 notes, the adjective βουκολικός is only used (here and in *Id.* 7) of song; the presence of actual shepherding in these poems is very limited.

¹⁴ Hunter (1999) 34 leaves the μ of μοίσας lower-case, but translates (p. 7) “have reached mastery in the bucolic Muse”, which nicely retains the image.

¹⁵ L. 24 ὥς ὅκα τὸν Λιβύαθε ποτὶ Χρόμιν ἦσας ἐρίσδων, “as once you sang in contest with Chromis from Libya”. See Hunter (1999) 75–76; Pretagostini (1992) 71 and this volume, pp. 54–55. There may be a further significance to Chromis’ origin. Libya is a standard metaphor for North Africa generally (i.e. including Egypt, including Alexandria) in Hellenistic poetry; cf. adesp. *AP* 7.42.5 on Callimachus’ dream: εὐτέ μιν ἐκ Λιβύης ἀναείρας εἰς Ἑλικῶνα, “when you, raising him up out of Libya to Helicon, etc.”. Yet whether or not there is a metapoetic note to Theocr. 1.24, Libya remains a place, as is Calydnā of l. 57, that lies outside of the bucolic landscape; both mark the mimetic character of the poem. In that sense these two external geographical reference points frame the poem, and “real” non-bucolic referents frame the bucolic landscape.

¹⁶ Cf. Walsh (1985) 3, who acutely notes that “Thyrsis belongs to a larger world of singing contests”.

refrain that a particular performative type becomes clear—in a bucolic setting, and invoking bucolic song, but at the same time clearly choral:

Ἄρχετε βουκολικᾶς, Μοῖσαι φίλοι, ἄρχετ' ἀοιδᾶς.

Begin, beloved Muses, begin the bucolic song.

The choral character of this performance is answered by the choral nature of the episode Thyrsis recounts in his song; in a sense, Daphnis becomes the leader of his own *threnos*. In the second part of the song (ll. 115–136) it is in turn Daphnis who “directs” the voices of nature, and he provides his own *sphragis* at ll. 120–121, in contrast with that of l. 65.¹⁷ The repetition of the refrains throughout Thyrsis’ song serves both to structure his composition, even to recreate in hexameter something of the strophic character of lyric *threnoi*, and also to effect a vivid imitation of actual performance.¹⁸ As Thyrsis has sung this song before, he will also sing, possibly this song, again. Lines 144–145 ὦ χαίρετε πολλάκι, Μοῖσαι / χαίρετ' ἐγὼ δ' ὑμῖν καὶ ἐς ὕστερον ἄδιον ἔσω, “farewell many times, Muses, farewell. I will sing more sweetly for you also anon”, is an evocative lyric *envoi* to his companions in the “Sufferings of Daphnis”, and marks his song, again, as the composition of a professional singer.¹⁹

Id. 10 reflects some of the same characteristics in phrasing song and song performance, though there is no equivalent of *Id.* 1’s refrain. The contrast in content of the two songs of *Id.* 10 comes to include their performative character, and the ‘qualifications’ of each singer to perform. Milon calls on Bucaeus to “strike up a love-song” (l. 22 τι κόρας φιλικὸν μέλος ἀμβάλευ, “strike up some love-song for the girl”), adding that Bucaeus was once known for his singing abilities (l. 23 καὶ μὰν πρότερόν ποκα μουσικὸς ἦσθα, “and, in truth, you were musically gifted before”), implying thereby, even if ironically, some type of “reception”, whether eye-witness or by reputation. Bucaeus calls, somewhat grandly given that this is a φιλικὸν μέλος, upon the Pierian Muses to sing with him (l. 24–25): Μοῖσαι Πιερίδες, συναείσατε τὰν ῥαδινὰν μοι / παῖδ' ὦν γὰρ χ' ἄψησθε, θεαί, καλὰ πάντα ποεῖτε, “Pierian Muses, sing with me of the slender girl. For whatever you touch, goddesses, all this you make beautiful”. ῥαδινός, rare in Homer (*Il.* 23.583, *HHom.Dem.* 183),

¹⁷ Cf. 1.120 Δάφνης ἐγὼν ὅδε τῆνος, “I am that Daphnis”, and 1.65 Θύρῳις ὅδ' ὧξ Αἴτνας, “this is Thyrsis from Aetna”. Each self-declaration is then of course followed by the respective calling upon bucolic divinities.

¹⁸ Pretagostini (1992) 70.

¹⁹ On this line cf. Goldhill (1991) 245, Pretagostini (1992) 71, Hunter (1999) 105.

is rather more common in lyric (esp. in Sappho in the Aeolic form βραδινός), where, in turn, it conveys in some instances a markedly epic flavor.²⁰ Indeed Bucaeus' song is imbued with a markedly lyric coloring; essentially he takes Milon's sardonic comment on Bombyca's thin figure (10.18 μάντις τοι τὰν νύκτα χοοῖξεῖται καλαμαία, "you will have a grasshopper to cuddle with all night", as a spring-board to launch into a lyric (albeit oddly uneven) celebration of her beauty. On one reading this invocation might suggest something more involved, perhaps a somewhat tongue-in-cheek take on the language of didactic poetry. And indeed the song does consist of a certain amount of low-key rustic wisdom. The last words of Bucaeus' song (l. 37 τὸν μὲν τρόπον οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν, "I cannot describe your ways") fold back to the level of hymnic invocation.

Milon, on praising his companion's harmonization (ll. 39–40 ἡ καλὰς ἄμμε ποῶν ἐλελάθει Βουκκος ἀοιδάς· / ὥς εὖ τὰν ἰδέαν τὰς ἀρμονίας ἐμέτρησεν, "truly we did not notice that Bucaeus made beautiful songs; how well he measured the form of his harmony") calls attention to the performative aspect of the song and to its plural audience. Milon then sings (l. 41) ταῦτα τὰ τῷ θεῷ Λιτυέρσῃ, "the words of divine Lityerses"; his song is not his own, but another's, and consists, in a different way, of a certain amount of rustic wisdom. Milon marks his song, in his concluding scoffing comments to his companion, as generic rather than specific, and one suitable for a public, plural, male audience rather than a private, single and female one (ll. 56–58):

ταῦτα χορὴ μοχθεῦντας ἐν ἀλίῳ ἄνδρας ἀεῖδεν,
τὸν δὲ τεόν, Βουκαῖε, πρέπει λμνηρόν ἔρωτα
μυθίσδεν τᾶ ματρὶ κατ' εὐνὰν ὀρθορνοῖσα.

These are the things men laboring in the sun should sing. As for your love and the hunger it brings, Bucaeus, this you should tell your mother in bed when she rises early.

Hunter's observation²¹ that Milon's praise is a disjointed two-part comment on the poem itself (l. 38) and the performance (l. 39) takes on

²⁰ Cf. Sappho fr. 115.2, 44b.7, 102.2 V. (of which more below); cf. also the somewhat problematic Σ Apoll. Rhod. 3.106 (p. 220 Wendel) τὴν δ' Ἥρη ῥαδινῆς ἐπεμάσσατο χειρὸς, "but Hera stroked her slender hand", which assigns somewhat different senses of this word to the lyric poets Stesichorus, Ibycus and Anacreon. Bucaeus' song draws on both lyric and hexameter models; his use of "epic in lyric" contrasts strikingly with his own "lyric in hexameter" composition. On this point I am indebted to discussion with E. Magnelli.

²¹ Hunter (1999) 210.

an even more appropriate character given Milon's own performance of another's song (l. 41 quoted above, "these words of the divine Lityerses"). A part of Milon's criticism is of Bucaeus' personalization of song; his own song performance centers on public (and plural) male work experience, the immediately perceptible (rather than internalized sensation and imagination), and a natural world that is utilitarian rather than a field for erotic metaphor.²²

In contrast with the performance of *Id.* 1, the songs of *Id.* 7 are rather differently figured. Simichidas, like Thyrsis, is celebrated as singer in a competitive sense (ll. 37–38 κῆμὲ λέγοντι / πάντες ἀοιδὸν ἄριστον, "and all say that I am the best singer"), and again, though now set in a specifically bucolic context, at ll. 91–95.

Λυκίδα φίλε, πολλὰ μὲν ἄλλα
 Νύμφαι κῆμὲ δίδαξαν ἄν' ὥρεα βουκολέοντα
 ἔσθλά, τά που καὶ Ζηνὸς ἐπὶ θρόνον ἄγαγε φάμα·
 ἄλλα τόγ' ἐκ πάντων μέγ' ὑπείροχον, ᾧ τυ γεραίρει
 ἄρξευμι·

Dear Lycidas, the Nymphs taught me too many other things as I would herd on the mountainsides, good things. And my fame has reached, I think, the throne of Zeus. But this is the best of all by far, with which I begin to honor you.

It is worth noting again that both here and at l. 37 the expression κῆμὲ, if perhaps mildly, ironically, self-deprecatory, also sets the singer *in a tradition* of singers.

Lycidas' characterization of his own song at l. 51 is somewhat different: τοῦθ' ὅτι πρᾶν ἐν ὄρει τὸ μελύδριον ἐξεπόνασα, "I worked out this little tune recently on the mountain", where μελύδριον, on the one hand self-deprecating, also 'encompasses' the work about to be sung in terms of generic expectations: Lycidas worked this out himself, there is no training etc. evoked, and the result is to be a "little song", sung by one singer.²³ A revealing characteristic of both singers is the way they see themselves in relation to the Muses (and to poetic competition);²⁴ Simichidas defines himself, his rival, and his rival's gift of a staff (here

²² For parallel considerations about *Id.* 10, see also Pretagostini, this volume, pp. 55–57.

²³ Cf. Bion fr. 8.1 Εἴ μευ καλὰ πέλει τὰ μελύδρια, "If my little songs are beautiful". See Reed (1995) 153, who sees the diminutive as a mark of Lycidas' "ironic modesty". Gutzwiller (1991) 170 notes that Lycidas' view of song composition is one that effectively "eschews ... poetic rivalry".

²⁴ On the significance of the Nymphs and of the Muses in Theocritus' bucolic poems see Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi-Hunter (2004) 151–156.

a symbol of poetic initiation) in terms of plural Muses, but Lycidas, interestingly, does not characterize himself in these terms. The single Muse who inspires Comatas in his song is further emblematic of Lycidas' aesthetic, which favors single figures and a somewhat solitary aura, in marked contrast to Simichidas, who construes his song in terms of plural referents and is always accompanied. In part this is reflective of the rustic/urban contrast of the two singers, but it is also evocative of a different poetic aesthetic, and one that appeals to a different type of audience/setting.²⁵ In that sense there is something of a parallel with the demarcation of *Id.* 10.

The songs of both *Id.* 3 and 11 are variations on the urban *paraklausithyra* that we know partially through their evolution in Greek epigram, and which Theocritus himself recalls in one of his urban mimes, *Id.* 2.118–128,²⁶ in the amusing threat of Polyphemus in *Id.* 6 to bar his “door” to Galatea,²⁷ and in his final injunction to the inattentive *eromenos* of *Id.* 29.²⁸ The rustic singers of both *Id.* 3 and *Id.* 11 look upon the natural features that impede access to their beloveds, in one case a cave, in another the sea; both call the object of their affections forth, both enter on a certain amount of histrionic threat that plays on real features of earlier love poetry.²⁹ In each case the song is framed by description of its delivery. In *Id.* 3 the singer gives this himself (l. 1 κωμάσδω, l. 52 οὐκέτ' αἰδῶ), thus metapoetically framing his own performance.³⁰ In *Id.* 11 the poem's narrator provides this; here the imperfects at ll. 14 κατετάκετο and 18 αἶειδε mark the performance as a repeated one.

²⁵ I compare these at length below, pp. 35–44.

²⁶ At *Id.* 6.32–33 Damoetas, in the role of Polyphemus, comically proposes casting Galatea in the role of comast by shutting his doors against her; see Hunter (1999) 256–257. The Grenfell Fragment (*CA* pp. 177–179) provides an example of a female singer, or male singer in a female role, cast in the role of comast. On this fragment see now Bing (2002) and Esposito (2002).

²⁷ *Id.* 6. 32–33 αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ κλαῖω θύρας ἔστε κ' ὁμόσση / αὐτὰ μοι στορεσεῖν καλὰ δέμνια τᾶσδ' ἐπὶ νᾶσσω, “but I will bar my doors until she swears herself to spread fair sheets upon this island”. The inviolate Polyphemus here, as the flower-gathering Polyphemus of *Id.* 11.25–27, in large part evokes our amusement through this (somewhat grotesque) reversal of expected gender roles—yet it is worth keeping in mind that there are indeed examples of *paraklausithyra* sung by female voices (e.g. the Grenfell Fragment, on which see above n. 26).

²⁸ *Id.* 29.39–40 τότα δ' οὐδὲ κάλεντος ἐπ' αὐλείαις θύραις / προμόλομί κε, πανσάμενος χαλέπω πόθῳ, “then though you should call I would not come to the doors of your house, on ceasing from my hard longing”.

²⁹ 3.25–27, 11.70–71.

³⁰ See Pretagostini (1992) 80–81.

Id. 6 is especially interesting in its configuration of song.³¹ An unnamed narrator, we assume Theocritus, sets the scene, the parameters of the contests in an ‘epistolary’ introduction to Aratus.³² Daphnis, the first ‘inset’ figure, then sings a song addressed to a ‘mythical’ character whose persona Damoetas assumes in his response. Line 20 τῷ δ’ ἐπὶ Δαμοίτας ἀνεβάλλετο καὶ τὰδ’ ᾄδεν, “and thereon Damoetas piped a prelude and thus began to sing” takes on a particularly responsive character—the result is almost an example of “capping”, or *skolia*, where the challenge for the second song is laid down in the first.³³ Damoetas crosses the boundary set up by the inner frame of the contest itself, and in essence becomes the figure addressed in Daphnis’ song. This is now a poetic dialogue on two levels,³⁴ and one that effectively obviates the conventions of song contest: hence in part no victory is possible. The poem’s slightly tongue-in-cheek ending: νίκη μὲν οὐδ’ ἄλλος, ἀνήσσονται δ’ ἐγένοντο, “the victory was of neither, but they were unbeatable” (l. 46) in part underlines the paradoxical quality of the poem. The confluence of song, and of singer *into* song, has eclipsed the competition.

3. *On songs sung*

The characterization of singer and song performance is one way in which the bucolic singer may be inscribed into the tradition of earlier song, whether of a largely monodic or choral character. Another is the specific evocation of an earlier song tradition, or earlier singer. The singing contest of *Id.* 7 sets two homoerotic love poems in juxtaposition, two poems that evoke several earlier singers of solo song, and so the contest becomes one of allusive models as well. The opening line of Lycidas’ song seems a metapoetic gesture especially pointed at archaic

³¹ On this poem see esp. Pretagostini (1992) 73, who sees the singing contest of *Id.* 6 as a particularly faithful imitation of amoebean singing contests. For a reading of *Id.* 6 and 7 as a diptych see Bowie (1996).

³² This poem, along with *Id.* 11 and 13, are all framed by opening sections (sometimes termed “epistolary”) and all three return at their respective conclusions to the frame. On the identification of the Aratus of l. 2, apparently the same figure as the Aratus of *Id.* 7.98, see Hunter (1999) 243.

³³ Hunter (1999) 253 translates ἀνεβάλλετο as “played a prelude”. Reference to a prelude, even in one word, allows slightly more distance between the two songs in the minds of the poem’s audience.

³⁴ Hunter (1999) 246.

Aeolic, and specifically Alcaic, poetry. In her study of the geographical and literary markers of *Id.* 7, Nita Krevans has insightfully illustrated the features of the early part of the song that define it as a *paidikon*,³⁵ and she touches particularly on the song's opening l. 52: Ἔσσεται Ἀγεάνακι καλὸς πλόος ἐς Μιτυλήναν, "For Ageanax there will be fair sailing to Mitylene". The motif is repeated at ll. 61–62 Ἀγεάνακι πλόον διζήμενῳ ἐς Μιτυλήναν / ὥρια πάντα γένοιτο, καὶ εὐπλοος ὄρμον ἴκοιτο, "for Ageanax seeking voyage to Mitylene may all be seasonable, and may he arrive with safe voyage to his haven", which effectively close the first part of Lycidas' song.³⁶ Imagery of journeying with metapoetic connotations finds parallels in other Hellenistic poets;³⁷ as Krevans demonstrates, the metapoetic connotation here is re-enforced by vocabulary and imagery of the Aeolic poets.³⁸ One of the particularly striking features of this introduction is that Theocritus, who himself introduces his Aeolic poems (*Id.* 28–31) with the image, in *Id.* 28, of his own journey to Miletus, and hence to the geographical realm, if not of archaic Aeolic poetry, of his archaic models more generally, has Lycidas, the poet of *Id.* 7, do the same.³⁹ In each case, a journey to the world of Alcaic παιδικὰ precedes the recitation of later Alcaic inspired songs of boy-love.

I would like to stay for a moment with Lycidas' song, and look at some other lyric parallels that arise in reading it, whether with song traditions or with individual poems. The second earlier poet who appears

³⁵ Krevans (1982) 213–214.

³⁶ Lycidas' song has a rather marked structure: opening wish (ll. 52–62), description of rustic symposiastic setting (ll. 63–72), song of Daphnis (ll. 72–82), song of Comatas (ll. 83–89).

³⁷ Cf. Callim. *Ia.* 13.11–14 ἐκ γὰρ [οὐτ'] Ἴωσι συμμείξας / οὐτ' Ἐφεσον ἐλθὼν, ἐστι. αμ. [/ Ἐφεσον, ὅθεν περ οἱ τὰ μέτρα μέλλοντες / τὰ χωλὰ τίττειν μὴ ἀμαθῶς ἐναύονται, "for from ... [neither] associating with the Ionians, nor going to Ephesus, which is ..., Ephesus, whence they intending to produce the limping metra are not unlearnedly inspired" (trans. Acosta-Hughes (2002) 63, adapted). Interestingly this image of journeying is also repeated, here at ll. 64–66. See Acosta-Hughes (2002) 74–79 and 99–103; Lelli (2004) 127–131 *passim*; Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 18–19.

³⁸ Krevans (1982) 214–215. See also Weingarth (1967) 30–36 and Winter (1974) 55–59. That the earliest known *propepmtikon* is Sappho fr. 5 V. is very revealing.

³⁹ *Id.* 28–31 are preserved by a papyrus codex from the Antinoite nome, which apparently consisted of three papyrus rolls; the third ("C") contained the Aeolic poems, in the order 28–31. *Id.* 29 opens with a quote from Alcaeus: I have argued in a forthcoming study of these poems that *Id.* 28 may end with one from Sappho. On the order of poems in the Antinoite codex see Gutzwiller (1996a) 140–142; my work, forthcoming with Princeton Univ. Press, *Cantat Alexandria: the Hellenistic Reception of Archaic Lyric*, treats these poems in chap. 3 (on Alcaeus).

implicated in this song is Sappho, and this is hardly surprising. Theocritus evokes the two poets together in his Aeolic poems, and the journey to Mytilene here serves as well by synecdoche for Sappho's Lesbos as well as Alcaeus' Mitylene. [Moschus], *Bion.epit.* 89 οὐ τόσον Ἀλκαίῳ περιμύρατο Λέσβος ἔραυνά, "nor so did lovely Lesbos bewail Alcaeus" and 91–92 ἀντὶ δὲ Σαπφοῦς / εἰσέτι σεῦ τὸ μέλισμα κινύρεται ἅ Μιτυλήνα, "for your music now, not Sappho's, Mitylene still mourns" provide a revealing parallel; this is a poem imbued with Theocritean influence (especially, but not exclusively, *Id.* 1).⁴⁰ An even more compelling parallel is Nossis, *AP* 7.718 = *HE* 2831ff.:

ᾠ ξεῖν', εἰ τύ γε πλεῖς ποτὶ καλλίχορον Μιτυλάναν
τᾶν Σαπφοῦς χαρίτων ἄνθος ἔναυσόμενος,
εἰπεῖν ὥς Μούσαισι φίλαν τήναι τε Λόκρισσα
τίκτεν ἴσας δ' ὅτι μοι τοῦνομα Νοσσίς, ἴθι.⁴¹

Stranger, if you sail to Mytilene of the lovely dances to be inspired by the flower of Sappho's graces, say that a woman of Locris bore one dear to the Muses and to her; you may know that my name is Nossis. Go.

A voyage to Mytilene becomes a metapoetic journey into the Aeolic (and lyric) past, one figured here, as in the hexameter lines of Lycidas' song, in one of the poetic genres that comes, in the Hellenistic period, to indeed appropriate the χαρίτων ἄνθος—of earlier lyric.

Two extant poems of Sappho are of particular interest in reading the opening lines of Lycidas' song. One is Sappho fr. 5 V, Sappho's prayer for the safe return of her brother Charaxus. While in a narrower generic sense the two poems, Sappho fr. 5 V. and Lycidas' song, are complementary rather than similar (Sappho's is a prayer for safe arrival rather than a *propemptikon*), the two share in their hopes for the safe journey of the figure concerned, in the destination of the beloved figure's voyage (Mitylene, Lesbos), and, if the widely-accepted reading at the opening of Sappho's poem Κύπρι καὶ Νηρηίδες is correct, in at

⁴⁰ On this poem cf. Hubbard (1998) 41–44. The catalogue of archaic poets (ll. 87–92) in a self-declared bucolic *threnos* is itself arresting. The lacuna posited after l. 92 of course has the effect not only of separating Theocritus from his lyric models (the juxtaposition that otherwise occurs of Theocritus and Sappho would be especially intriguing), but also separates Hellenistic from archaic poetry. It might well be worth reconsidering the question of this lacuna again; a close association of Sappho and Theocritus seems in many ways very credible. Wilamowitz in his edition posited εἰ δὲ as the opening of l. 93, rather than the ἐν δὲ of the mss. tradition, and omitted the lacuna.

⁴¹ The text is that proposed by Gutzwiller (1998) 85.

least two of the divine figures that appear in Lycidas' song.⁴² Nothing in the Sappho fragment itself as we have it suggests where Charaxus is coming from; the assumption in the scholarship⁴³ that this poem is involved with the tale of Charaxus' sojourn in Egypt and his association with the courtesan Rhodopis (Dorica) is based on circumstantial evidence. That said, were this poem addressed to Charaxus on a journey from Egypt to Lesbos, it would be all the more effective as a model for Lycidas (and his poet, Theocritus), as in the later poem we have also a journey from Ptolemaic (i.e. Egyptian, if by association) Cos to the realm of an Aeolic singer. Sappho's association with Egypt (and, for that matter, Alcaeus', whose biographical tradition suggests that he spent some time in exile there), is an obvious attraction to the Alexandrians and their configuration of geopoetics.

Sappho fr. 94 V. is also perhaps implicated here.⁴⁴ This poem, while differently configured than Lycidas' song, has some remarkable parallels with it nonetheless. One of two figures, or both, are deeply grieved on parting (the speaker of the opening line, *τεθνάκην δ' ἄδὸλως θέλω*, "truly I want to die", is unclear); Sappho then urges the comfort that memory in absence can bring (ll. 7–8 *χαίροις' ἔρχεο κα̐ μεθεν / μέμναις', οἴσθα γὰρ ὥς <σ>ε πεδήπομεν*, "go and fare well, and remember me, for you know how we cared for you"). The poem follows with a remembrance of time spent together in a vivid mosaic of garlands, perfume, and other imagery of *habrosyne*, among which the figures are perceived, it appears, as lying together (ll. 21–22 *καὶ στρώμ[αν ἐ]πὶ μολθάκαν / ἀπάλαν παρ[ε]*). In Lycidas' imagined scene he lies apart rather than with Ageanax;⁴⁵ memory will serve in the future (l. 69 *καὶ πίωμα μαλακῶς μεμναμένος Ἀγεάνακτος*, "I will drink at my ease, remembering Ageanax") to set the timbre of this rustic drinking scene where Lycidas will celebrate the safe arrival of his beloved, garlanded (l. 64) and lying among rustic flora (ll. 67–68, here the bucolic equivalent of Sappho's "soft sheets"). Lycidas' poem shares also, if only due to a common set of symposiastic imagery, some of the specific garland motifs that are extant in Sappho.⁴⁶ Characteristic of all three poems (Lycidas' song and

⁴² Some scholars, among them Merkelbach (1957) 24 n. 1, think that this poem is in fact a *propemptikon*; on the circumstances of its performance see Lardinois (1996) 165–166.

⁴³ Cf. e.g. Page (1955) 48–51.

⁴⁴ Cf. already Walsh (1985) 12.

⁴⁵ See further Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 137.

⁴⁶ On ll. 63–64 *κῆγ' ὅ γε κατ' ἄμαρ ἀνήκοντον ἢ ῥοδόεντα / ἢ καὶ λευκοῖον στέφανον*

both songs of Sappho), however, is their shared “occasion”; the small poem that figures great distance, and the expression of longing and hope for safe return that this distance evokes. Theocritus’ use of Sappho is well-known; he is a careful reader of Sappho, and easily reconfigures her language and images in his own verse.⁴⁷ The confluence of both Aeolic poets here is, again, a feature that may be paralleled in Theocritus’ Aeolic poems; it is intriguing that Lycidas should sing a song that closes with the juxtaposed images of two earlier singers, both encased in wooden chests, both inspired singers cast in the same positive imagery of song in which he casts himself. Noteworthy especially is the parallel of l. 85 *κηρία φεοβόμενος ἔτος ὥριον ἐξεπόνασας*, “you too, on honeycomb fed, did endure with toil the springtime of the year” where *ἐξεπόνασας* parallels *ἐξεπόνασα* (l. 51) of Lycidas’ poetic self description. The slight echo in ll. 50–51 *ὄρη ... ἐν ὄρει* and l. 85 *ὥριον* is surely not accidental.

The song of Simichidas, juxtaposed in a complex way to that of Lycidas, seems also juxtaposed in the song types that it evokes.⁴⁸ Such juxtaposition of artistic forms is indeed typical of Theocritus’ singing contests; this one, however, is especially remarkable for the multiplicity of counterpoised models.⁴⁹ While Lycidas evokes earlier Aeolic poetry and earlier bucolic traditions, Simichidas’ song resonates with rustic ritual (esp. of Pan), invective, songs to Eros and *paraklausithyra*. Among Lycidas’ models are Alcaeus and Sappho; among Simichidas’ are Archilochus and Anacreon. The contrast of the two singers, and their songs, is often phrased in rustic/urban terms, and there is some clear support for this in the poem’s narrative; the journey of Simichidas and his two companions is distinctly framed, as that of Socrates and his companions in Plato’s *Phaedrus*, as one from city to countryside.⁵⁰ Another way of phrasing this contrast might focus on the performative circumstances

περὶ κρατὶ φυλάσσω, “and I, on that day, keeping a crown of dill or roses, or white violets about my head” cf. Sappho fr. 81.4–5 V. σὺ δὲ στεφάνοις, ὦ Δίκα, πέρθεσθ’ ἐράτοις φόβαιον / ὄρπακας ἀνίτῳ συν(α)έρραισ’ ἀπάλαισι χέρσιν, “and you, Dica, bind lovely garlands in your hair, weaving together fronds of dill with your soft hands”; cf. also Alcaeus fr. 362 V.

⁴⁷ See esp. Pretagostini (1984) 105–117.

⁴⁸ Krevans (1983) 214–217 is especially good on this juxtaposition of song types. See also Stanzel (1995) 280–282.

⁴⁹ The multiple models is one of several features that render the poem a difficult read: cf. Gutzwiller (1991) 159, 169; Hutchinson (1988) 206–212.

⁵⁰ *Id.* 7.1–2 Ἦς χρόνος ἀνίξ’ ἐγὼν τε καὶ Εὐκρίτος εἰς τὸν Ἄλεντα / εἵρομες ἐκ πόλιος, σὺν καὶ τρίτος ἄμμιν Ἀμύντας, “Time was when Eucritus and I were going from town

the two songs encompass; Lycidas seems primarily to evoke solo performance, whereas at least three of the songs represented in Simichidas' aria, the abuse of Pan, of Philinus, and the *paraklausithyron*, appear to evoke group settings. The same is true of the rustic symposiastic scenes, that of Lycidas' imagined setting and the setting that closes the poem; Lycidas imagines himself alone but for bucolic figures, Simichidas and his urban companions form a group at their friend's Thalsia. Lycidas focuses also on the excellence of song; Simichidas, whose own song is framed as an example of excellence, does not.⁵¹

Simichidas' song, recited on a rustic journey, moves from the urban association of Simichidas' ἑταῖροι to a rustic cult of Pan and then back to the urban setting of the *paraklausithyron*; in this it is emblematic of the idyll as a whole, which moves from urban setting to rustic journey to the rustic symposium at the end.⁵²

Lines 115–119 form a small self-contained prayer to the Erotes:

ὔμμες δ' Ὑετίδος καὶ Βυβλίδος ἀδὺν λιπόντες
 νᾶμα καὶ Οἰκοῦντα, ξανθᾶς ἔδος αἰπὺν Διώνας
 ὃ μάλοισιν Ἔρωτες ἐρευθομένοισιν ὁμοῖοι,
 βάλλετε μοι τόξοισι τὸν ἡμερόεντα Φιλίνον,
 βάλλετ', ἐπεὶ τὸν ξεῖνον ὁ δύσμορος οὐκ ἔλεει μεν.

and you, leave the sweet stream of Hyetis and Byblis, and Oecus, the sheer seat of shining Dione, O Loves like blushing apples, for me strike lovely Philinus with your bows, strike him, since the wretch takes no pity on my friend.

There are several contemporary associations that this small hymnic address to the Erotes may encompass, and these also inform its resonance on a contemporary audience; however there is a particular

to the Haleis, and Amyntas made a third with us". On the Platonic overtones of this opening setting see Hunter (1999) 145–146.

⁵¹ See Hutchinson (1988) 206–207. Lycidas apostrophizes the earlier shepherd-singer Comatas with the epithets *μακαριστέ*, "blessed" (l. 83) and *θεῖε*, "divine" (l. 89). *θεῖος* used in Hellenistic poetry of earlier singers is a particular mark in the language of emulation; cf. Theocr. 16.44 (of Simonides) εἰ μὴ θεῖος αἰοδὸς ὁ Κήιος αἰόλα φωνέων, κτλ., "had not an inspired singer, the man of Keos, etc." (accepting the reading *θεῖος* in this line). Cf. also Callim. fr. 64.9 (also of Simonides) Κήιον ἄνδρα τὸν ἱερόν, "the sacred man of Keos". ἀδὺν μελισσομένης, "making sweet music" in the last line of Lycidas' song recalls the opening of Thyrsis' words of *Id.* 1 (ll. 1–2 Ἀδύ τι τὸ ψιθύρισμα ... μελίσσεται, "sweet is the whispered music") just as *κατεκέχλισο*, "lie down" in the same line and the attendant scene description appears to recall the goatherd's language of *Id.* 1; Lycidas is imagining himself, in a sense, in the bucolic setting of the other poem.

⁵² For a sensible *caveat* against laying too much emphasis on an urban/rustic contrast here, see Hutchinson (1988) 207 n. 110.

archaic lyric model that I would like to highlight here.⁵³ The poet whose imagery of Eros seems to particularly imbue a number of Hellenistic treatments of Eros is Anacreon. The modern reader of Theocritus, who attempts to engage with his lyric models, needs of course to make a careful distinction here between Anacreon and Anacreon's later reception (particularly the *Anacreontea*, but also Horatian reception); Theocritus' reading of Anacreon is not, as is ours, if even subliminally, impacted by this long later tradition.⁵⁴ Yet a reading of the extant fragments of Anacreon still offers a couple of striking parallels when set against this short hymnic song of Simichidas. Both the confluent imagery of Eros attacking and Eros at play, and the vivid imagery of the youthful face find compelling parallels in Anacreon,⁵⁵ as does the short prayer to Eros.

Lines 120–121 transition to a different setting, an invective chant, and a different archaic model, Archilochus. The publication of the Cologne epode gave a hitherto unknown model for these invectively colored lines that set Simichidas' chanting women in a tradition of observers of faded or fading beauty.⁵⁶ Theocritus' adaptation is revealing as much for the manner of adaptation itself as for the variety of his models. There are some marked linguistic parallels between these lines and the Archilochus fragment,⁵⁷ and also between these lines and other descriptions of passing youth in bucolic;⁵⁸ the character of their inser-

⁵³ See Hunter (1999) 186–187, Krevans (1983) 207–208.

⁵⁴ On Anacreon as a model for later poetic tradition(s) Rosenmeyer (1992) 12–49 is now the seminal discussion.

⁵⁵ For the first, cf. *PMG* 358.1–4 σφαίρη δηῦτέ με πορφυρῇ / βάλλων χρυσοκόμης Ἔρως / νήνι ποικιλοσαμβάλω / συμπαίζειν προκαλεῖται, “again golden-haired Eros, casting a purple ball at me, summons me to play with a fancy-sandaled girl”; *PMG* 357.1–5 ὦναξ [sc. Dionysus], ᾧ δαμάλης Ἔρως / καὶ Νύμφαι κυανώπιδες / πορφυρῇ τ' Ἀφροδίτῃ / συμπαίζουσιν, ἐπιστρέφεται / δ' ὑψηλὰς ὄρεων κορυφάς, “Lord, with whom subduing Eros, and the dark-faced nymphs and purple Aphrodite play, you wander among the high peaks of mountains”. For the second cf., e.g., *PMG* 360.1–2 ὦ παῖ παρθένιον βλέπων / δίξημαί σε, “boy with virginal glance, I desire you ...”. *PMG* 358 and 357 are especially effective parallels if they can be considered to be complete poems. See further on the Anacreon echo here Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi-Hunter (2004) 159. On the motif of Eros at play in fr. 357 see Rosenmeyer (2004) 165, on fr. 358, *ibid.* 166–167.

⁵⁶ As A. Henrichs observed in a pioneering study of this poem and these lines of Theocritus' *Id.* 7 (Henrichs 1980).

⁵⁷ On *Id.* 7.120 πεπαιτερος and Archil. *IEG* 196a26 πέπειρα, *Id.* 7.121 τό τοι καλὸν ἄνθος ἀπορρεῖ and *IEG* 196a27 ἄνθος δ' ἀπερρύηκε παρθενίον see Henrichs (1980) 21–24, Hunter (1999) 187–189.

⁵⁸ For a semantically somewhat different, yet nonetheless tantalizing parallel on youthful death cf. Theocritus on Daphnis, *Id.* 1.140 χὼ Δάφνης ἔβα ῥόον (Bion, *Adon.epit.*

tion here is particularly striking. In a largely homoerotic poem, and certainly in this specific narrative of unrequited homoerotic desire, the women's choral lament for Philinus' passing beauty is intriguing. Theirs is a gaze external to the immediate setting, and to the love of Aratus; yet it is their perception of Philinus' passing beauty that serves, at least in Simichidas' exhortation, as the catalyst for abandoning the suit for the boy. And while the exclamation αἰαῖ is appropriate for its setting in observing passing beauty, as the Cologne Epode, among other erotic texts, shows,⁵⁹ one cannot help but wonder if another lamented male beauty is partly evoked here, that of Adonis. The female ritual cry αἰαῖ Ἀδωνιν, "Alas, Adonis" recalled here in the female lament for the fading *eromenos*, also inscribes, however obliquely, a nocturnal women's ritual that juxtaposes nicely here with the nocturnal men's ritual of the *paraklausithyron* in the following lines.⁶⁰

At the same time, Philinus' epithet at l. 118 ἡμερόεις, "lovely" and the metaphor of his (albeit fading) beauty at l. 121 καλὸν ἄνθος, "fair bloom", find arresting parallels in the all male imagery of sympotic love poetry. Simonides, *IEG* 22 appears to depict an idealized reunion of speaker and *eromenos* (here Echekratides) on an island, the speaker, significantly, having regained the beauty of a young man.⁶¹ Evocation of the male, nocturnal symposium here complements that of the female nocturnal Adonis ritual, and compellingly suggests multiple regards gazing at the figure of Philinus, as well as casting Philinus in multiple song traditions.

At ll. 121–125 the address is now a plural male one, Simichidas including himself in his exhortation to Aratus; his song encompasses a striking variety of person and referent, himself, his friend Aratus, his

55 τὸ δὲ πᾶν καλὸν ἐς σὲ καταρρεῖ, which while recalling a differently centered line of Theocritus' *Id.* 1 (l. 5 ἐς τὲ καταρρεῖ), happens in Bion's poem also to be used of the beauty of the dead Adonis). On καταρρεῖ and the underworld see Reed's (1997) note to this line (p. 228); Theocritus must be playing on this general image at l. 140.

⁵⁹ Cf. *IEG* 196a.26 αἰαῖ, πέπειρα; see also Anacreon, *PMG* 432 καὶ πέπειρα γίνομαι; Henrichs (1980) 11–13.

⁶⁰ While, as Hunter (1999) 189 observes on l. 121, τὸ καλὸν ἄνθος is a fairly generic image of young male beauty, it may not be coincidence that the image of fading flowers is also associated with the dying Adonis (see Reed (1997) 239 on Bion, *Adon.epit.* 76 ὥς τῆνος τέθνακε καὶ ἄνθεα πάντ' ἐμαράνθη, "as he has died, all flowers too have faded").

⁶¹ Cf. *IEG* 22.11–12 ὄφρα γέο[ν] χ[αριε]ντος ἀπὸ χροὸς ἀν[θος] / λείβοι δ' ἐκ βλ[ε-φάρ]ων ἡμερόεντα [πόθος], "that the youthful flower from his graceful flesh, and that might distill desireful longing from the eyes". Cf. also fr. 20.5 ἄνθος ἔχει πολυήρατον ἥβης, "has the much loved flower of youth". The pioneering study of these fragments and Theocritus' *Id.* 7 is Hunter (1993), who suggests, however, that Simonides, *IEG* 22

prayer to Pan, his prayer to the Erotes, the utterance of women, and now the exhortation of men. The *paraklausithyron* is both a conventionally male ritual, and also an urban one; so too is the wrestling school, from which it has been suggested that the image εἷς δ' ἀπὸ τᾶσδε ... ἄγκοιτο παλαίστρας, "let one alone be pinned in that gym" of l. 125 is drawn.⁶²

According to Nita Krevans' attractive idea, whereas Lycidas' song looks in terms of its models more to the past, that of Simichidas looks rather to the present,⁶³ and it is certainly pertinent that Lycidas' song concludes with a gesture to the bucolic past with an unrealizable wish, whereas Simichidas' song gestures to the future with a realizable one. The reading in these pages adds, I think, a few more co-ordinates to this picture. Lycidas looks primarily to earlier song where there is a single referent; there is further a narrative character in the songs of Daphnis, of Comatas, that is missing in Simichidas' models. Simichidas' song is dotted with plurality, with group figures and voices. It is strikingly emblematic that his is a shared experience (it is not his own love, but his friend's that he sings); Lycidas' is a far more individual voice (indeed it is telling that in his vision of his own rustic banquet he appears to be the sole banqueter). As Lycidas appears, and leaves the scene, markedly solo, Simichidas is accompanied throughout: by his friends on his rustic journey, by his companions in the symposiastic scene that closes the idyll, and by other figures throughout his song. There are traditions of both types of situation in earlier monodic song: one might well see in Lycidas' song monody's single singer, in Simichidas' song monody's plural audience.

Another reading of these two juxtaposed songs, and of the Theocritean character of each, might perceive in them Theocritus' com-

may be one model behind the opening of Lycidas' song (ll. 61–71). How fitting, though, to the juxtaposition of the two songs if they were in this case to make use, though differently, of the same elegiac passage of Simonides.

⁶² Di Marco (1995). Di Marco suggests (see in particular pp. 633–635) that this image is drawn from the *pankration*. Some support for his interpretation may come from both Callim. *AP* 12.73.5–6 = *HE* 1061–1062 (with Gow's restoration) Θεΰτιμον δίφρησον· ἐκεῖσε γὰρ ἢ λιθόλευστος / κείνη καὶ δύσερως οἶδ' ὅτι που στρέφεται, "seek for Theutimos; for I know it is somewhere there that the gallows-bird, the love-lorn, is loitering", where στρέφεται may in part be meant as a wrestling image; see also Strato *AP* 12.222. Cf. also *Id.* 1.97–98 τὴν τὸν Ἔρωτα κατεύχεο, Δάφνι, λυγξεῖν / ἣ ὅ' οὐκ αὐτὸς Ἔρωτος ὑπ' ἀργαλέω ἐλυγίχθης, "truly, then you boasted, Daphnis, that you would throw Love. But haven't you yourself been thrown by hard Love?".

⁶³ Cf. Krevans (1983).

mentary on his own poetry, and his models, in terms of his own poetry.⁶⁴ The association of Theocritus with Simichidas begins already in the scholia to the poem, and has had a long history in Theocritean scholarship.⁶⁵ While we might be inclined today to eschew some of the biographical details that comprised the once popular interpretation of *Id.* 7 as a “masquerade bucolique”, it is nonetheless possible to see Simichidas as representative of both the poet himself and some of his poetic endeavor. Theocritus’ *Idylls* do, after all, include the figure of the rustic god Pan (*Id.* 1.123–126), the Erotes (*Id.* 15.120–123), female lament of the dead Adonis (*Id.* 15) and *paraklausithyra*, or rustic versions of them (*Id.* 3 and 11). Lycidas’ song too shares obvious affinities with other poems of Theocritus (Daphnis in *Id.* 1, but it is also possible to see *Id.* 28 as sharing in some of the features of *propemptikon*). There are contemporary parallels for this type of poetry of self-recall; Callimachus’ fourth *Iambus* particularly comes to mind here.⁶⁶ Especially revealing is the reflection of Theocritean models: Alcaeus, Sappho, Anacreon, Archilochus and archaic iambic, Adonis song and *komos* are all voices of song that resonate in other poems of Theocritus. Further, *Id.* 7, in its juxtaposed rustic and urban songs is itself a metaphor for its poet’s entire oeuvre.

Theocritus’ rustic *paraklausithyra* inherently call forth a distinction of urban and rustic character; their humor lies in part in the paradox of the urban feature recreated in a non-urban setting. The ivy and fern of Amaryllis’ cave impede the progress of *Id.* 3’s comast; Polyphemus, unable to swim, is excluded by the water’s edge. Both singers depend on a long tradition of comastic song;⁶⁷ there is, however, another type of model worth considering here, the short song that views a distant object of desire, urges its attention or explains its lack of attention, and creates a scenario, indeed almost an implied dialogue, with multiple perspectives.⁶⁸ The archaic poet Anacreon is a master of representing this type of internal discourse; several of his extant poetic fragments

⁶⁴ See Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi-Hunter (2004) 138, 157.

⁶⁵ Σ Theocr. 7.21 (p. 84 Wendel); see Fantuzzi, below, pp. 252–254.

⁶⁶ See Acosta-Hughes (2002) 199–203.

⁶⁷ Hunter (1999) 107–109; *Id.* 2.118–128 delineates some of the features of standard urban *komos*, which, as Burton (1995) 65–66 has shown, Simaetha strikingly mirrors in some of her own actions.

⁶⁸ In this regard Anacreon in a sense pre-figures some of the character of Hellenistic epigram, even when we assume that Anacreon’s poetry is intended for performance. On the appearance of internal dialogue in archaic lyric in this regard see Walsh (1991) 5–7.

evoke similar types of thought pattern as those we see in Theocritus' rustic comasts. *PMG* 417 is particularly suggestive when read against Theocritus' unlucky singers.

πῶλε Θρηκίη, τί δή με
 λοξὸν ὄμμασι βλέπουσα
 νηλέως φεύγεις, δοκεῖς δέ
 μ' οὐδὲν εἰδέναι σοφόν;
 ἴσθι τοι, καλῶς μὲν ἂν τοι
 τὸν χαλινὸν ἐμβάλοιμι,
 ἥνίας δ' ἔχων στρέφοιμι
 σ' ἄμφι τέρματα δρόμου·
 νῦν δὲ λειμῶνάς τε βόσκειαι
 κοῦφά τε σκιρτῶσα παίζεις,
 δεξιὸν γὰρ ἵπποπειρήν
 οὐκ ἔχεις ἐπεμβάτην.

Thracian filly, why casting a glance aslant with your eyes do you pitilessly avoid me, and assume that I've no skill? Know you, well could I cast a bridle upon you, and with the reins I could turn you about the ends of the race. But now in the fields you graze and lightly frolicking you play, and have no able horseman with experience as your rider.

The poem is itself a sustained metaphor; the singer transfers a series of sexual images, an older man's desire for a young girl, to the imaging of a riderless horse.⁶⁹ Standard equestrian imagery used of e.g. *hetairai* suggests that this poem is rather less original in this respect than it may at first appear to the modern reader, although the sustained image is striking.⁷⁰ What is especially effective here is the metaphor's ability to effect a sense of distance between viewer and viewed, and to allow the creation of an imagined "dialogue" between them. The girl/filly is aware of the singer's presence, has assessed his qualifications (an assessment he contests), prefers to frolic elsewhere, and has no understanding of the benefits the singer can confer. A comparative reading with Theocritus' rustic *paraklausithyra* is revealing. Both the singer of *Id.* 3 and Polyphemus (explicitly at *Id.* 6.21–22) have some sort of evasive eye-contact with the object of desire,⁷¹ both give their assumed reasons for

⁶⁹ On the background to this metaphor see esp. Rosenmeyer (2004) 170–171.

⁷⁰ Cf. e.g. Asclepiades, *AP* 5.203 = *HE* 832ff., *AP* 5.202 = *HE* 974ff. The latter is sometimes assigned to Posidippus (e.g. in the edition of Austin and Bastianini); this seems rather more likely in light of the section of *PMil.Vogl.VIII* 309 dedicated to horse-racing that includes the figure of at least one hetaira.

⁷¹ *Apoll. Rhod.* 3.444–445 ἐπ' αὐτῷ δ' ὄμματα κούρη / λοξὰ παρὰ λιπαρὴν σχομένη θηεῖτο καλύπτειν, "and the maiden looked at him with stealthy glance, holding her bright veil aside" may in part be recalling this image in Anacreon. The same image is

their rejection, more detailed in the case of Polyphemus, each giving a voice to a beloved otherwise absent in the poem. And both the singer of *Id.* 3 and Polyphemus (again at greater length in *Id.* 11) detail the benefits that their love can confer upon the object of their song. Particularly arresting here in the Anacreon poem are the fields of l. 5, where the Thracian filly frolics, and which are (at least in some respect) inaccessible to the poet, whose venue is rather the race-course. The metaphor of the rider looking at the horse in nature rather than in a cultured setting (here the race course) again pre-figures the set-up of the rustic *paraklausithyron*, where e.g. Galatea's leaving the sea and taking up pastoral pursuits (*Id.* 11.63–66) would represent a transition from nature to culture (Theocritus' rather tongue-in-cheek take on Homer's *anomos* Polyphemus).

This is not to say that Anacreon, *PMG* 417 is, or exactly prefigures, a *paraklausithyron*; again, part of the appeal of Theocritus' bucolic serenades is their anachronistic setting, and this is only really effective if an explicitly urban model can be perceived behind the rustic imitation. The settings evoked in a number of Anacreon's poems, including this one, are rather harder to gage. What *is* recognizable in Anacreon's song is something of a parallel structure: address to the distanced object of desire, imagined discourse, imagined transition to a state of union rather than separation, and a physical impediment to that union.⁷² In that sense the *λεμιώνες* of Anacreon do prefigure Theocritus' rustic doors; the *locus amoenus* of the girl's frolicking is perceived by the male viewer, but is also, as yet, an area from which his gaze is only a distanced one.⁷³

Another Anacreon poem, *PMG* 358, also probably complete, serves as an intriguing parallel in its double perception to the double perception of the songs of *Id.* 6:

σφαίρη δηῖτέ με πορφυρῇ
βάλλων χουσοκόμης Ἔρωος

used quite often of outrage, as at [Theocr.] 20.13 καὶ ὄμμασι λοξὰ βλέποισα, “disdainfully looking at me with her eyes”.

⁷² The poem seems complete as preserved. The comment of Heraclitus, *quaest. Hom.* 5 seems in some ways a rather odd reading of the poem. See Rosenmeyer (2004) 171, Hutchinson (2001) 278.

⁷³ See Rosenmeyer (2004) 172, who sees a contrast of female and male perceptions of the same locus: “in *PMG* 417, from the perspective of the young girl (assuming she is not a *hetaira*), it is a *locus* of innocent play; for the voyeuristic male narrator, it is a space to be filled up by his “skill”, a wildness to be turned into pursuit and conquest, therefore, I would argue for the existence of a gendered perspective on this *locus amoenus* ...”.

νήνι ποικιλοσαμβάλω
 συμπαίζειν προκαλείται
 ἢ δ', ἐστὶν γὰρ ἅπ' εὐκτίτου
 Λέσβου, τὴν μὲν ἔμην κόμην,
 λευκὴ γάρ, καταμέμφεται,
 πρὸς δ' ἄλλην τινὰ χάσκει.

Casting a purple ball, Eros calls me again to play together with a fancy sandaled girl. But she, for she is from well-founded Lesbos, finds fault with my hair, for it is white, and gapes at another.⁷⁴

The singer of this short song sets up a series of juxtapositions: youth *vs* age, dark *vs* light, god *vs* mortal, invitation/challenge *vs* rejection, erotic images of differing tone.⁷⁵ There is also a dual perception of eros, and the singer's erotic condition; in the poem's first period this is one of (apparently) youthful *habrosyne*; in the second the singer is perceived as colorless (or old), and an object of scorn. This dual perception is heightened by the response to each feature of the first period in the second, and in particular by the shift of agent in l. 5; here the girl, the object of erotic gaze in the first four lines, becomes in turn the one who views, scorns, and subsequently gapes elsewhere.

Such a reading of Anacreon, *PMG* 358 takes on a somewhat different character when read against the bucolic *agon* of *Id.* 6. I should underline at the outset that in this case we are not necessarily dealing with a model as such, although Theocritus clearly does recall Anacreon elsewhere.⁷⁶ Rather the structural patterning of the two works is revealing, if, of nothing else, of their shared traditions. Daphnis observes that Galatea casts apples at Polyphemus and challenges him. With Daphnis the audience of his song perceives Polyphemus piping on the shore, and the scene around him. Daphnis' closing comment to Polyphemus is that Galatea flirts with him. Damoetas responds, in the character of

⁷⁴ The translator is at a real disadvantage here, as "other", clearly feminine in Greek, may refer either to another girl (l. 3 νήνι), another hair (in contrast with l. 6 κόμην), or even, conceivably, to another ball (and so another erotic game?). See Bing-Cohen (1991) 90 n. 3, Hutchinson (2001) 277–278.

⁷⁵ On χάσκειν as a metaphor for fellatio see Gentili (1988) 96; Hutchinson (2001) 276–277 takes χάσκει rather as admiration in contrast with καταμέμφεται.

⁷⁶ There are other moments of lyric recall in both songs of *Id.* 6; e.g., l. 17 καὶ φεύγει φιλέοντα καὶ οὐ φιλέοντα διώκει, "she flies the wooer, and when one woos not, follows" plays on Sappho fr. 1.21–24 V. καὶ γὰρ αἱ φεύγει, ταχέως διώξει / αἱ δὲ δῶρα μὴ δέκετ', ἀλλὰ δώσει / αἱ δὲ μὴ φίλει, ταχέως φιλήσει / κῶν' ἐθέλοισα, "if she runs away, soon she shall pursue; if she does not accept gifts, why, she shall give them instead; and if she does not love, soon she shall love even against her will".

Polyphemus, observing the same scene. The figure viewed becomes the figure that views, the components of the first song are re-configured in the second, each song concluding with a didactic touch, Daphnis' apparently invoking, in his association of Eros and the (not) beautiful, one of the repeated (and repeatedly reconsidered) themes of Plato's *Symposium*,⁷⁷ Damoetas as Polyphemus invoking folk-wisdom, with the marvelous (apparent) ending of l. 40 ἐξεδίδαξε.

ἐξεδίδαξε at l. 40 comes as a somewhat sardonic surprise, and this works on several levels. The old woman (here Cotyttaris) as instructor finds several parallels elsewhere in Theocritus' poetry,⁷⁸ particularly playing here on the Homeric Polyphemus, a figure famously *anomos* and so unlikely to be "educated" in much of anything.⁷⁹ There is also surely a slight in-joke in the use of διδάσκω in this context, an odd verb for instruction in spitting (although less so of avoiding the evil-eye), but the expected verb in the context of the figure of *praeceptor amoris*.⁸⁰ This complements the paideutic gesture at ll. 18–19 (ἦ γὰρ ἔρωτι / πολλάκις, ὦ Πολύφωμε, τὰ μὴ καλὰ καλὰ πέφανται, "indeed often, Polyphemus, through love what is not beautiful is revealed as beautiful"), which itself sets the mark of a particular paideutic heritage, that of symposiastic discourse on the nature of Eros, on the *agon* of *Id.* 6. For this line, and also its corollary at *Id.* 13.3 οὐχ ἅμιν τὰ καλὰ πρώτοις καλὰ φαίνεται ἡμεν, "not for us first does the beautiful appear beautiful", are surely not only a parallel play on the possible variation in prosodic quality of καλφά,⁸¹ as well as one (of many) striking intratextual alignments in

⁷⁷ Cf. Plato, *Symp.* esp. 201c, of which Alcibiades' perception of Socrates' internal beauty at 215–216 is the actual realization.

⁷⁸ Especially the sieve-diviner Agroeo of *Id.* 3.31, but also the mother of Philista of *Id.* 2.145.

⁷⁹ Contrast the heroic figure of Telemus, l. 23: ὁ μάντις ὁ Τήλεμος, "Telemus the seer", echoing Homer's fuller presentation (*Od.* 9.508–510) ἔσκε τις ἐνθάδε μάντις ἧς τε μέγας τε, / Τήλεμος Εὐρυμίδης, δς μαντοσύνη ἐκέκαστο / καὶ μαντευόμενος κατεγύρα Κυκλώπεσσιν, "there lived here a soothsayer, a good man and tall, Telemus, son of Eurymus, who surpassed all men in soothsaying, and grew old as a seer among the Cyclopes"—a far more heroically impressive "teacher".

⁸⁰ Cf. Callim. fr. 67.1: Αὐτὸς Ἔρως ἐδίδαξεν, "Eros himself taught (Acontius)", which pre-figures a long tradition in Roman elegy. One wonders whether in fact ἐξεδίδαξε here is not in part a play on Nicias' response to *Id.* 11, preserved in the introductory Σ to that poem (p. 240 Wendel, = *HE* vol. 2, 429): Ἦν ἄρ' ἀληθὲς τοῦτο, Θεόκριτε· οἱ γὰρ Ἔρωτες / ποιητὰς πολλοὺς ἐδίδαξαν τὸ πρὶν Ἀμουσούς, "This then was true indeed, Theocritus: the instructions of the Loves turn many, who knew not the Muses before, into poets". This would then be yet one more of the several points of tangent between the two poems.

⁸¹ See Hunter (1999) 253 for parallels; Callim. *AP* 12.43.5 = *HE* 1045 Λυσανίη, σὺ

Theocritus, but point to a specific philosophical sympoasiastic discourse as well as to the song traditions of symposia, in particular homoerotic love song.

Ewen Bowie has suggested that the introductions to *Id.* 6, 11, and 13, which frame the mythological *exempla* that follow and have sometimes, perhaps somewhat anachronistically, been called “epistolary”, might better be seen as recalling early sympotic song, and the circumstances of its occasion, including the paradigmatic/paideutic character of these songs.⁸² I would add that the evocation of this song tradition might also be recalling a prose mimetic symposium, where song, and types of song, are replaced (if this is the right term) by speeches, as in Plato’s *Symposium*.⁸³ Yet these are speeches that celebrate, from different perspectives, the same subject (Eros), and speeches which play, in their ordering, upon one another. Lines 18–19 are particularly significant here. For the subject of the beautiful, and to whom the beautiful appears beautiful (not to mention the parentage of Eros), is very much the subject of several speeches in this dialogue, especially those of Agathon and Socrates.⁸⁴ So the singers of *Id.* 6 engage in a bucolic contest, in part on the nature of Polyphemus as lover, that in turn partly recalls the sympoasiastic setting of Plato’s dialogue on the nature of Eros—the conceit is the more effective if, with Bowie, we understand Daphnis and Damoetas here in fact as erotically involved.⁸⁵

Thus *sympotika* is multiply present in a poem like *Id.* 6; in the types of song it resonates, however distantly, in its subject and in its frame; and the poem is itself offered as illustration of contest and its limits.⁸⁶

δὲ ναίχι καλὸς καλός, “Lysanies, truly you are lovely, lovely”, is a revealing parallel not only for its shared elegiac background but also for the ethical character of the poem.

⁸² Cf. Bowie (1983) and Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 171–172. An influential perception of these poetic frames as “epistolary” was Rossi (1972).

⁸³ I am grateful to Brian Calabrese for enlightening discussion on this point.

⁸⁴ Cf. esp. 201b4–10. 6–7: τὸ ἐνδεὲς κάλλους καὶ μηδαμῇ κεκτημένον κάλλος ἄρα λέγεις οὐ καλὸν εἶναι, “do you say that what is lacking in beauty and does not possess it in any way is beautiful?”, which recreates in prose something of the effect of poetic play on καλός. In his commentary to *Id.* 13.3 Hunter (1999) 266 attractively posits Euripides, *TrGF* (10)F136.1–4 as the text Theocritus may be citing, but I wonder if it is not both. It is, of course, pertinent that Agathon is a tragedian. There may be a similar coalescence with the opening of *Id.* 11; the scholia provide the opening of Nicias’ reply (see above, n. 80), a paraphrase of Euripides, *TrGF* (61)F663, but we can see a similar confluence here with the opening of Plato’s *Lysis* (204d3–7), where Love turns the shy Hippothales into a singer of *paidika*.

⁸⁵ Bowie (1996) 93.

⁸⁶ We do not know the singer’s relationship to the Aratus of l. 2, although Bowie’s

The singing contest of *Id.* 10 evolves somewhat differently, through an initial dialogue that defines Bucaeus, in part, as singer of erotic song. There is a slight tongue-in-cheek quality in this characterization; Bucaeus suffers from ἀγρυπνία, “sleeplessness” (l. 10), mark of both lover and poet, and even Milon’s initial comment (l. 6): ὃς νῦν ἀρχόμενος, κτλ., “if now at the start you etc.”, given the frequent use of ἀρχομαι in the Theocritean corpus to denote the opening of song, has a slightly sardonic metapoetic character here (for us, the poem’s audience, Bucaeus’ song has, indeed, as yet not begun). The song itself, Bucaeus’ small hymnic ode to Bombyca, is both a self-contained whole and at the same time clearly imitates, in its quatrain structure, something of the character of true song performance.⁸⁷ The short song has both invocation and *envoi*, in which Bombyca, the song’s somewhat less than grand *laudanda*, has now attained the divine characteristic of having qualities too great/many/fine to be related (ll. 24–37):

Μοῖσαι Πιερίδες, συναείσατε τὰν ῥαδινάν μοι
παῖδ’ ὣν γὰρ χ’ ἄψησθε, θεαί, καλὰ πάντα ποεῖτε.
Βομβύκα χαρίεσσα, Σύραν καλέοντί τυ πάντες,
ἰσχνάν, ἀλιόκανυστον, ἐγὼ δὲ μόνος μελίχρων.
καὶ τὸ Ἴον μέλαν ἐστί, καὶ ἅ γραπτὰ ὑάκινθος·
ἀλλ’ ἔμπας ἐν τοῖς στεφάνοις τὰ πρῶτα λέγονται.
ἅ αἶξ τὰν κύτισον, ὁ λύκος τὰν αἶγα διώκει,
ἅ γέρανός τ’ ὠροτρὸν· ἐγὼ δ’ ἐπὶ τὴν μεμάνημαι.
αἶθε μοι ἥς ὅσσα Κροισὸν ποκα φαντὶ πεπᾶσθαι·
χρῦσοι ἀμφοτέροί κ’ ἀνεκείμεθα τᾷ Ἀφροδίτῃ,
τὼς αὐλὼς μὲν ἔχοισα καὶ ἡ ῥόδον ἢ τύγε μάλον,
σχῆμα δ’ ἐγὼ καὶ καινὰς ἐπ’ ἀμφοτέροισιν ἀμύκλας.
Βομβύκα χαρίεσσ’ οἱ μὲν πόδες ἀστράγαλοί τευς,
ἅ φωνὰ δὲ τρύχνης· τὸν μὲν τρόπον οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν.

Pierian Muses, sing with me of my slender girl. For whatever you touch, all this you make beautiful. Lovely Bombyca, all call you Syrian, thin, sun-burnt; I alone call you honey-skinned. The violet too is dark, so too the inscribed hyacinth. But truly in garlands these are accounted first.⁸⁸

proposal ((1996) 95) that he is in the role of *eromenos* here (rather than *erastes* of *Id.* 7) is intriguing. On the role of Theocritus’ singing contests as sources for our knowledge of earlier singing contests see now also Collins (2004) 54–58.

⁸⁷ The conventional arrangement of these hexameter lines as distichs, and the song itself off-set from the surrounding poem, of course both reflects and emphasizes this.

⁸⁸ Assuming λέγονται, “say, call”, which has the advantage of answering the sense of calling/naming in l. 26: καλέοντί τυ πάντες. Hunter (1999) 207–208 prefers λέγω, “gather” with τὰ πρῶτα then adverbial. There is a certain discomfort with both, which may reflect something of Bucaeus’ clumsy poetic self-expression. One advantage of

The goat pursues the cytissus, the wolf pursues the goat, the crane the plough. But I am mad for you. Had I all that they say Croesus once possessed, we would both be set up in gold for Aphrodite, you with your flutes and either rose or apple, I with new outfit and shoes from Amyclae on both feet. Lovely Bombyca, your feet like knucklebones, your voice a poppy's. Your nature I cannot relate.

Bucaeus' hymn to Bombyca is marked, with a slight smile to generic expectation, with cletic invocation of the Muses, *envoi* with statement of the singer's *aporia*, and ring composition in the address to Bombyca in the Βομβύκα χαρίεσσα of ll. 26 and 36. The last two lines of the song reverse, in their elements of art object, evocation of nature and 2nd person address, the features of the three quatrains of the song: 2nd person address and celebration, comparison with the natural world, and *ekphrasis* of imagined art objects. Bucaeus' wish for Croesus' proverbial wealth (l. 32) has the effect at the same time of evoking the world of 6th-cent. Lydia, and of the attendant Lydian *habrosyne*, the imagery of which imbues Sappho's poetry. Characteristic too of Sappho's verse are the specific flowers of Bucaeus' comparison, the violet and the hyacinth, as well as the type of compound adjective μελίχλωρος, if not the epithet itself.⁸⁹ Critical descriptive language of girls is also not absent from Sappho, particularly in the extant fragments of the third book of the Alexandrian edition.⁹⁰ Sappho's presence in this song may, however, be even more marked. As it has been argued in a recent and very suggestive study of *Id.* 10,⁹¹ Sappho fr. 102 V. may be specifically implicated here:

Γλύκηα μάτερ, οὗτοι δύναμαι κρέκην τὸν ἴστον
πόθῳ δάμεισα παῖδος βραδίναν δι' Ἀφροδίταν.

Sweet mother, truly I cannot weave the web, for I am overcome with longing for a youth through slender Aphrodite.

Already Bergk suggested altering the Sapphic text to read παῖδος βραδίνῳ to reflect its imitation in Theocritus' text;⁹² yet even without assuming Bergk's reading, the parallels, as Lentini succinctly observes,

λέγω, "say, call" here is that it implicates, as does λέγεται, "the saying goes", at *Id.* 29.1, earlier occasion(s).

⁸⁹ Cf. e.g. Sapph. fr. 185 V.: μελίφωνος, "soft-voiced"; Alcaeus fr. 338 V. has μέλιχρος, "honeysweet" of wine.

⁹⁰ Cf. fr. 55–57 V., also fr. 49.2 (this from the second book).

⁹¹ Lentini (1998).

⁹² My one hesitation is the specification of male gender that would then result; elsewhere in Sappho παῖς is often feminine; it seems unwise to write the possible

are striking. Even more striking, perhaps, is Bucaeus' recitation of a song resonant of Sappho in this setting (and in his voice). Milon's criticism of him, and of his song (ll. 56–58), is one that clearly demarcates interior from exterior, male from female song, and robust working singer (μοχθεῦντας ... ἄνδρας) from pining lover (λιμηρόν ἔρωτα). Yet it is precisely here, in erotic song, that bucolic poetry can give the most resonance to earlier erotic poetry, and where short song can most readily evoke earlier short song. Like Bucaeus' γραπτὰ ὑάκινθος, a present image that at the same time recalls earlier marking and legend, the bucolic short songs themselves resound, and at the same time recall earlier songs, earlier singers, and earlier occasions for singing.

homeroptic reference out of the poem. Further Aphrodite usually (although not always) appears in Sappho with an accompanying epithet.

HOW BUCOLIC ARE THEOCRITUS' BUCOLIC SINGERS?

ROBERTO PRETAGOSTINI

Theocritus was already considered by the ancients to have been the inventor of bucolic poetry, in as much as he developed a new literary genre based on a series of contents that we can now understand to have been present in oral performances of a pre-literary character. Such performances are actually documented among the shepherds of Magna Graecia and Sicily,¹ can be reconstructed for the shepherds of Cos,² and may at least be hypothesized for those living in other parts of the Greek-speaking world. It should come as no surprise, then, that all of Theocritus' poetry, both that which is expressly bucolic and that which is not,³ either overtly identifies with a certain rustic reality or at least is pervaded by continuous references to it. While it is true that Theocritus was, in practice, the inventor of bucolic poetry, it is still legitimate to ask ourselves what image Theocritus sought to represent of the new figure of the bucolic literary poet or, in other words, how Theocritus intended to present himself to his public as a bucolic poet. We can actually locate the answer to this question within Theocritus' poetic production, which, as I will try to show, describes an overall set of circumstances in which the new bucolic genre operates as the result of a twofold process: the transposition of an anthropological reality into the literary sphere of pastoral song,⁴ and the transposition to the rustic environment of features typical of the urban world, with respect both to its actuality and to its manifestations in the literary sphere. Let us first begin with the transposition of pastoral song into the literary sphere.

¹ Diod. Sic. 4, 84, who is perhaps borrowing from Timaeus, *FGrHist* 566F83, attributes the origin of bucolic poetry to the legendary Sicilian shepherd Daphnis, who is also the protagonist of the song of the shepherd Thyrsis in Theocritus' *Id.* 1. On the 'invention' of a pre-existing bucolic tradition by Theocritus, see Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 136, 138 n. 23, 154–155.

² Suffice it to think of the shepherd Lycidas (Theocr. 7.52–89), where the songs of Tityrus are mentioned, again dealing with Daphnis and the mythical Comatas.

³ Pretagostini (1999) 14–22.

⁴ For this characteristic of Theocritus' poetry, cf. Serrao (1977a).

The first, and in some ways the most significant, example is offered by *Id.* 1, which is centred, as we know, around the figure of Daphnis who, according to Timaeus, was the archegete of bucolic poetry.⁵ In this poem, which is a rustic mime based on a dialogue between the shepherd Thyrsis and an anonymous goatherd, Thyrsis is invited by his interlocutor to sing a song (ll. 64–145). The goatherd does not actually express a generic invitation to Thyrsis to sing, or even to sing a new song—this would have been an obvious metaphor for the widespread Hellenistic poetics of novelty—but rather, in exchange for entitlement to milk a twin-bearing she-goat three times and to receive a wooden cup, he asks for the ‘repetition’ of a song about the “sufferings of Daphnis” (l. 19, τὰ Δάφνιδος ἄλγεα).⁶ It is explicitly specified that this song had originally been performed in a singing contest held on an ‘international’ level, since it had been presented in a competition with a Libyan singer well-known to the goatherd as well. This representation leads us to imagine the existence of a complex circuit of ‘traditional’ authors who took part in pastoral contests, and so possessed their own well-consolidated repertoires (ll. 23–28):

... αἱ δὲ κ' αἰείσης
ὥς ὅκα τὸν Λιβύαθε ποτὶ Χρόμιν ἄσας ἐρίσδων,
αἷγά τέ τοι δωσῶ διδυματοκόν ἐς τρεῖς ἀμέλξαι,
ἃ δὴ ἔχουσ' ἐρίφως ποταμέλγεται ἐς δύο πέλλας,
καὶ βαθὺ κισσύβιον κεκλυσμένον ἄδει κηρῷ,
ἀμφῶες, νεοτευχές, ἔτι γλυφάνοιο ποτόσδον.

and if you sing as once you sang in your match with Chromis from Libya, then will I let you milk three times a goat that has borne twins, one that, for all she has two kids, yet yields two pails besides. And I will give you a deep cup, washed over with sweet wax, two-handled, and newly fashioned, still fragrant from the knife.

The invitation is subsequently and more forcefully repeated following the description of the artistically carved wooden cup, which, together with the opportunity to milk the goat, represents the reward for the singer (ll. 60–61):

... τῷ κά τυ μάλα πρόφρων ἀρεσαίμαν
αἷ κά μοι τύ, φίλος, τὸν ἐφίμερον ὕμνον αἰείσης.

gladly would I pleasure you therewith, my friend, if you will sing to me that lovely song,

⁵ See above n. 1.

⁶ For parallel considerations, see Acosta-Hughes, this volume, pp. 29–31.

In spite of its transposition into solemn dactylic hexameters, Thyrsis' song recalls its original folkloristic character in its use of a verse that serves as a refrain (ll. 64 etc., 94 etc., 127 etc.) and divides his hexameters into several short, irregular groups of verses, as if they were stanzas of an actual song.⁷ The song ends with the invitation that the goatherd deliver the promised reward, the cup and the goat to be milked, since Thyrsis wants to immediately use the milk to make a libation to the Muses (ll. 143–144):

καὶ τὸ δίδου τὰν αἶγα τό τε σκύφος, ὥς κεν ἀμέλξας
σπείσω ταῖς Μοῖσαις.

and do you give me the goat and the bowl, that I may milk her and make libation to the Muses.

The goatherd's two exhortations and Thyrsis' final request are clear indications that the song about the sufferings and the death of Daphnis is performed for a reward, which in turn leads us to view recompense as one of the routine motivations for performances of bucolic poetry. The occasion for performance of pastoral song is thus equated with the origin of most 'high' Greek poetry of the archaic and classical periods (excluding epic and sympotic poetry), which was, for the most part, composed on commission or designed for agonistic or mercenary competitions. At the same time, the thoroughly rustic character of the prizes offered by the goatherd underscores the particular nature of instances of pastoral singing. Thus the framework of Theocritus' *Id.* 1 presupposes that pastoral song has a past, i.e. an independent history of its own that pre-dated Theocritus' poem. This unique history, moreover, witnessed a perfectly balanced parallelism between 'high' poetry and the specificity of the bucolic subject-matter.

The allusion to a lyric past with reference to rustic song becomes one of the principal aims of the image of singing that Theocritus wishes to communicate in *Id.* 10. This poem takes the form of a short dialogue between two reapers, Milon and Bucaeus, spoken as they are working. We learn from the dialogue that Bucaeus no longer applies himself to his work as he did before, because he has fallen in love with Bombyca. Milon knows what a good singer he is and so advises Bucaeus to sing a love-song for his beloved as a method of making his work more pleasant (ll. 22–23):

⁷ Cf. Wilamowitz (1906) 137–151 (in particular on *Id.* 1 pp. 148–150), Rossi (1971b) 85.

καί τι κόρας φιλικὸν μέλος ἀμβάλευ. ἄδιον οὕτως
ἐργαξῇ, καὶ μὲν πρότερόν ποκα μουσικὸς ἦσθα.

and strike some love song for the girl. You will work happier so; and you used to be a singer too in old days.

Bucaeus' song (ll. 24–37), which in Theocritus' literary transposition is cast entirely in dactylic hexameters, is in reality simply the imitation of a song that the reader is led to believe was originally composed of lyric *cola*, according to Milon's comment on his friend's performance (ll. 38–39):⁸

ἦ καλὰς ἄμμε ποῶν ἐλελάθει Βοῦκος ἀοιδάς·
ὥς εὖ τὰν ιδέαν τᾶς ἁρμονίας ἐμέτρησεν.

truly Bucaeus was a maker of lovely songs, and we never knew it. How well he measured out the pattern of his tune!

It is difficult to decide whether Milon's observation is ironic, but the most striking feature of the lines is his comment on Bucaeus' ability to μετρεῖν τὰν ιδέαν τᾶς ἁρμονίας. This expression should be interpreted as a reference to the fact that the song was really sung in a lyric metre, as it would otherwise make no sense for Milon to use here the term *harmonia* (which has a rhythmical-musical significance and can only be applied to lyric compositions) with reference to the recitative, and by nature stichic, hexameter.⁹

But Milon does not limit himself to congratulating Bucaeus on his performance; he also contrasts it not with a love-song, but with a song about work, the *Lityerses*.¹⁰ This song, which once again is presented as the re-proposal of a pre-existing repertoire or even as a piece of a very ancient tradition—it is attributed to the mythical Lityerses (l. 41), who had also been linked to Daphnis, the prototypical hero of bucolic poetry, in a satyr play by Sositheus, one of Theocritus' contemporaries¹¹—takes the form of a succession of pairs of hexameters:

⁸ Cf. Pretagostini (1992) 82–84 and Hunter (1996) 125–126.

⁹ Thus Pretagostini (1992) 82–83. See also Acosta-Hughes, this volume, pp. 31–33.

¹⁰ As regards the *Lityerses*, the work-song of farm labourers, and Lityerses, the mythical Phrygian hero who is supposed to have been its εὐρετής, some information is supplied by Pollux 4.54 Bethe, Photius, *Lex.* λ 362 and 363 Theodoridis, *s.vv.* Λιτυέρσαν and Λιτυέρσης, *Suda* λ 626 Adler, *s.v.* Λιτυέρσης. In view of its characteristics, the *Lityerses* may be included in the category of traditional songs connected with a specific kind of occupation (cf. Gow (1952) vol. 2, 204).

¹¹ Δάφνις ἢ Λιτυέρσης, *TGF* 99F1a–3. According to Hunter (1999) 212, in associating Milon with Lityerses and condemning Bucaeus' "starving" love (l. 57) *Id.* 10 replays the myth of Sositheus in a different mode: Bucaeus "becomes a comically lovesick

each pair, complete in itself, contains a proverb that refers to the world of agriculture. In spite of Theocritus' adoption of a literary guise, the clearly marked structure, proverbial content and attribution to a mythical figure like Lityerses all emphasise a certain pretence of traditionalism. On the other hand, it is possible to recognise in the country-folk wisdom, under the cover of Theocritus' hexametric distichs, a sort of complementary foil to the gnomic-aristocratic erudition of the elegiac couplets of Theognis.

A contest between shepherds, one of the most significant events in country life, is the main subject of *Id.* 5 and 6. In *Id.* 5, the shepherd Lacon challenges the goatherd Comatas to a bucolic contest in which the winner will take home a prize; the competitive nature of the contest is repeatedly underscored:

ἀλλ' ὦν αἶ κα λῆς ἔριφον θέμεν, ἔστι μὲν οὐδέν
ἱερὸν, ἀλλὰ γέ τοι διαείσομαι ἔστε κ' ἀπείπης

but come, if you care to stake a kid—it is no great matter—why, I will sing a match with you until you have had enough (ll. 21–22)

...

αὐτόθε μοι ποτέρισδε καὶ αὐτόθε βουκολιάσδευ

compete from there then, and sing your song from there (l. 60)

...

... ἄμμες γὰρ ἐρίσδομες, ὅστις ἀρείων
βουκολιαστάς ἐστι

for we have a match to decide which is the better singer of country songs (ll. 67–68)

...

εἴα λέγ', εἴ τι λέγεις

come, if you have anything to say, out with it (l. 78).

Lines 31–32 transfer this competitive dispute even to the choice of location for the song's performance:

... ἄδιον ᾄσῃ
τεῖδ' ὑπὸ τὰν κότινον καὶ τᾶλσεα ταῦτα καθίξας.

you will sing more pleasantly if you sit here beneath the wild olive and these trees.

In Theocritus, of course, the bucolic contest (ll. 80–135) of the “cut and thrust” kind has undergone a process of transposition into the liter-

Daphnis whose ‘bucolic’ sufferings find no pity in Milon’s harsh, Hesiodic conception of the world”. More on Sositheus’ piece in Di Marco, this volume, p. 480.

ary sphere, by virtue of which the poet regularly attributes one pair of hexameters to each of the two competitors. As would have happened in real life, the first rival takes on the task of the ‘proposal’, while the other one is entitled to give the ‘answer’. The basic character of the real contest is maintained, i.e. the precise correspondence between proposal and answer on the one hand and between each “cut and thrust” pair on the other. There is thus both a horizontal correspondence, evident from the thematic homology between the remark of the proposer and the responder, and a vertical one, apparent with respect to the principle of non-contradiction of what has been said in the previous agonistic repartee.¹² It is clear that in a contest whose rules are based on the extempore nature of the formulation of both ‘proposal’ and the relevant ‘response’, the duration of the performance must necessarily be imagined to coincide with that of its composition, which consequently has to ‘pretend’ to be of an oral nature, albeit within the framework of literary elaboration established by Theocritus.

Id. 6, too, presents a bucolic contest between the shepherd Damoetas and the cowherd Daphnis (ll. 3–5):

... ἐπὶ κράναν δέ τιν' ἄμφω
 ἐσδόμενοι θέρεος μέσῳ ἄματι τοιάδ' ἄειδον.
 πρῶτος δ' ἄρξατο Δάφνις, ἐπεὶ καὶ πρῶτος ἔρισεν.

and at a spring the pair sat down, in summer at noonday, and thus they sang; and Daphnis first began, for he first proposed the match.

This time, however, the two opponents do not challenge each other to a rapid contest of rejoinders, but undertake to sing one brief song each. Daphnis sings the first song, on the theme of Polyphemus’ love for Galatea (ll. 6–19). After l. 20, τῷ δ' ἐπὶ Δαμοίτας ἀνεβάλλετο καὶ τὰδ' ἄειδεν, “and thereon Damoetas piped a prelude and thus began to sing”, the line that marks the pause between the two songs and their agonistic opposition—even if this opposition is softened by the non-conflictual disposition of the two shepherds—Damoetas, who now assumes the role of Polyphemus, presents his song in responsion to the theme also treated by Daphnis in ll. 21–40. The contest ends in a tie, with no winner (l. 46, νίκη μὲν οὐδάλλος, ἀνήσασται δ' ἐγένοντο, “nei-

¹² In the wake of the seminal work of Merkelbach (1956), we owe to Serrao (1977a) 181–190 (cf. also Serrao (1975)) the demonstration, by means of a rigorous, detailed structural analysis of the contest between Lacon and Comatas, that “the contest of *Id.* V offers a structural repetition of the bucolic contest’s real-life basis” (pp. 189–190), and succeeds at recovering its rules and basic characteristics, as very briefly expounded here.

ther won the victory, but invincible they proved") and with a mutual exchange of gifts, perhaps enacted to emphasise the perfect harmony existing between the two shepherds, about whom the possibility of a sexual relationship has even been suggested.¹³

But apart from this conclusion, the poetic contest staged between the cowherd Daphnis and Damoetas is perhaps the most accurate example of how pastoral poetic contests, like the one between Thyrsis and Chromis mentioned in *Id.* 1, must have actually taken place. In his response-song, Damoetas refers not only to many of the themes mentioned by Daphnis in his proposal-song, but even goes so far as to assume the 'mask' of Polyphemus: this disguise, too, may be a literary pretence for what was, in reality—or for what was to be imagined to be—a sort of mini-mime competitively staged by the shepherds.

Confirmation of this pretence of orality comes from a poem in the Theocritean corpus, *Id.* 8, which, despite being spurious,¹⁴ has a poetic structure clearly modelled on *Id.* 5 and 6 and presents an amalgamation of their different agonistic forms. The author tells of the encounter between the cowherd Daphnis and the shepherd Menalcas and of the challenge to a poetic contest that the two exchanged on that occasion (ll. 5–10):

πρῶτος δ' ὦν ποτὶ Δάφνιν ἰδὼν ἀγόρευε Μενάλκας·
 "μυκητᾶν ἐπίουρε βοῶν Δάφνι, λῆξ μοι αἰῖσαι;
 φαμί τυ νικασεῖν, ὅσσον θέλω αὐτὸς αἰεῖδων".
 τὸν δ' ἄρα χῶ Δάφνης τοιῶδ' ἀπαμείβετο μύθη·
 "πομῆν εἰροπόκων οἶων, συρικτὰ Μενάλκα,
 οὔποκα νικασεῖς μ', οὐδ' εἴ τι πάθοις τύγ' αἰεῖδων".

and seeing Daphnis, Menalcas first began: "Daphnis, guardian of the lowing kine, will you sing with me? If the songs be of the length I choose, I say that I shall vanquish you". And thus to him Daphnis in turn made answer: "Piper Menalcas, shepherd of the fleecy sheep, never will you vanquish me—not even if you do yourself a mischief with your singing".

We may admit, together with Gow,¹⁵ that the second hemistich of l. 7, ὅσσον θέλω αὐτὸς αἰεῖδων, partly on the basis of the following l. 10, οὔποκα νικασεῖς μ', οὐδ' εἴ τι πάθοις τύγ' αἰεῖδων, should be interpreted as a reference to the duration of the song within the framework of the contest, but in my opinion this expression has a more specific meaning

¹³ Lawall (1967) 66–73; cf. Gutzwiller (1991) 123–124 and Bernsdorff (1994) 40–43.

¹⁴ Rossi (1971a).

¹⁵ Gow (1952) vol. 2, 172–173.

connected with the challenger's prerogative to choose the themes of the song himself. If my interpretation is correct this represents further indication, provided by an imitator of Theocritus, of the great care with which Theocritus constructs a pretence of orality for the bucolic songs of his shepherds. The contest itself, for which the prizes are respectively a calf and a shepherd's pipe (ll. 14–20), takes place in the presence of a goatherd who will act as judge (ll. 25–29). The idyll is divided into two parts, which seem to combine the “cut and thrust” exchange of *Id.* 5 with *Id.* 6's juxtaposition of two songs. In the first part (ll. 33–60) Menalcas, to whom the lot of starting off the contest has fallen (l. 30, *πρῶτος δ' ὧν ἄειδε λαχὼν ἱνκτὰ Μενάλκας*, “first, then, clear-voiced Menalcas sang, for to him the lot had fallen”), proposes a series of brief considerations that, as a matter of course, begin with praise of his own activity as a bucolic singer (ll. 33–34, *αἶ τι Μενάλκας / πῆποχ' ὁ συρικτὰς προσφιλὲς ἔσσε μέλος, κτλ.*, “if ever the piper Menalcas pleased you with a song, etc.”). Daphnis immediately responds, in accordance with the “cut and thrust” pattern of song already seen in *Id.* 5, by in turn extolling his own skill as a singer (ll. 37–38, *αἶπερ ὁμοῖον / μουσίσδει Δάφνις ταῖσιν ἀηδονίσιν, κτλ.*, “if Daphnis makes music like the nightingales, etc.”). In the second part of the composition, preceded by ll. 61–62 which mark the division between the two different agonistic forms, first speaks Menalcas, ll. 63–70, then Daphnis, ll. 72–80—l. 71 acts as a hinge between the two songs; this also calls attention to the agonistic contrast. They perform one brief song each about the same subject, i.e. praise for their own herds of animals: Menalcas praises his sheep while Daphnis praises his cows. At the end of the poetic contest, the goatherd awards the first prize to Daphnis (l. 84, *λάσδεο τὰς σύριγγας, ἐνίκασας γὰρ ἀείδων*, “take you the pipes, for you are victorious in the singing”), and asks him to be taught the art of composing bucolic songs while tending their flocks, offering one goat as payment for the instruction (ll. 85–86, *αἶ δέ τι λῆξ με καὶ αὐτὸν ἄμ' αἰπολέοντα διδάξαι, / τήναν τὰν μυτῦλαν δωσῶ τὰ διδακτρά τοι αἶγα, κτλ.*, “and if, as I herd my goats beside you, you teach me, I will give you for your teaching yonder stump-horned goat, etc.”). Thus the theme of apprenticeship in bucolic poetry, a theme already central to Theocritus' *Id.* 7, is both strongly present and has its oral character specifically emphasised: pastoral poetry can be taught while pasturing one's flock. The two different forms of the bucolic contest are clearly underlined, not only by a distich that marks both the *explicit* of the ‘cut and thrust’ part and the *incipit* of the more properly ‘lyric’ section (ll. 61–62, *ταῦτα μὲν ὧν δι' ἀμοιβαίων οἱ παῖδες ἄεισαν, / τὰν πυμά-*

ταν δ' ὠδᾶν οὕτως ἐξᾴρχε Μενάλκας, "thus in alternate strains sang the boys, and thus Menalcas led the last song"), but also by the use of a different metre in each of the two parts: the 'cut and thrust' section of the first part consists of elegiac couplets, which are very likely meant to convey the idea of the rapid alternating remarks of the two singers, but which might also be meant as something very alike to what the epigrammatic genre is for 'high' literature; the two bucolic songs of the second part are, instead, arranged in dactylic hexameters.

As I have already mentioned, *Id.* 7, *The Harvest Festival*, is centred around the theme of the bucolic poet's apprenticeship: it describes the investiture of Simichidas-Theocritus as a pastoral poet by the goatherd Lycidas (ll. 43–48); the subsequent performance of the two *boukolias-moi* by Lycidas (ll. 52–89) and by Simichidas-Theocritus (ll. 96–127) thus takes place outside the context of a competition. If anything, the intention behind the contrasting songs is to show, by means of the two paradigms, the difference between the more properly bucolic song of Lycidas and the largely 'urban' character of that of Simichidas-Theocritus; even if the latter already has some experience in bucolic poetry, as we read in ll. 91–95, which we shall presently examine, at the beginning of his song he declares that he comes from the town and presents himself as a poet who is still serving a term of apprenticeship as regards bucolic themes. On the strength of this implicit didactic aim, the two songs—Lycidas' is a *propemptikon* for the beloved Ageanax, while Simichidas-Theocritus' celebrates the sufferings of his friend Aratus, who is in love with Philinus—prove to be important pieces from the repertoires of the two singers, which were not composed there and then but rather previously, as both Lycidas (ll. 50–51, κῆγ' ὁ μὲν—ὄρη, φίλος, εἴ τοι ἀρῆσκει / τοῦθ' ὅτι πρᾶν ἐν ὄρει τὸ μελύδριον ἐξεπόνασα, "and I—see, friend, if it please you, this ditty I fashioned of late on the hill") and Simichidas-Theocritus (ll. 91–95, Λυκίδα φίλε, πολλὰ μὲν ἄλλα / Νύμφαι κῆμ' εἰδᾶσαν ἀν' ὥρεα βουκολέοντα / ἐσθλά, τὰ που καὶ Ζηνὸς ἐπὶ θρόνον ἄγαγε φάμα· / ἄλλα τόγ' ἐκ πάντων μέγ' ὑπείροχον, ᾧ τυ γεραίρειν / ἀρῆεῦμ'), "friend Lycidas, many another thing the Nymphs have taught me too as I tended my herd upon the hills, fine songs, whose fame report, maybe, has carried even to the throne of Zeus; but of all is this the first by far, wherewith I will begin to do you honour") take care to point out *when* they had first presented their performances. And it is extremely important that both songs, according to the intentions of Theocritus, should be considered to have been composed orally, since the herdsmen thought them up while pasturing their sheep

on the mountainside (l. 51, ἐν ὄρει, and l. 92, ἀν' ὄρεα). We also find a significant programmatic purpose in the introduction to the song by Simichidas-Theocritus. The clear allusion to Hesiod, *Theog.* 22–23: αἶ νύ ποθ' Ἡσίοδον καλὴν ἐδίδαξαν ἀοιδίην, / ἄρνας ποιμαίνονθ' Ἑλικῶνος ὑπο ζαθέοιο, “and they [the Muses] taught Hesiod once upon a time a beautiful song, while he was pasturing his sheep under holy Helicon”, contained in the above-quoted ll. 91–92, is tantamount to claiming a venerable Hesiodic origin for the poetry ‘of shepherds’, while at the same time ‘correcting’ this origin, making it more specific by substituting the theogonic Muses with the Nymphs, who so often take the place of the Muses in Theocritus’ bucolic poetry as the inspiration behind his songs.¹⁶ As for Lycidas’ preceding song, it openly evokes the world of archaic Lesbian poets, and possibly also hints at Simonides’ paederastic poems.¹⁷

One of the details of the song by Simichidas-Theocritus also repeats the pretence of the traditional repertoire seen already in connection with Thyrsis’ song in *Id.* 1. After declaring that his friend Aratus is in love with a boy (ll. 98–99), Simichidas-Theocritus adds in ll. 99–102:

... οἶδεν Ἄριστις,
ἐσθλὸς ἀνὴρ, μέγ' ἄριστος, δὲ οὐδέ κεν αὐτὸς ἀείδειν
Φοῖβος σὺν φόρμιγγι παρὰ τριπόδεσσι μεγάροι,
ὥς ἐκ παιδὸς Ἄρατος ὑπ' ὁστίον αἶθετ' ἔρωτι.

Aristis knows, a man of worth, the best of men, whom Phoebus himself would not grudge to stand and sing, lyre in hand, by his own tripods—knows how to the very marrow Aratus is aflame with love of a boy.

Just as the story of Daphnis had already been presented in song by Thyrsis while competing with Chromis on the occasion of a contest whose name, however, is unknown to us, in the same way Aratus’ love for Philinus, celebrated by Simichidas-Theocritus in his *boukoliasmos*, had likely already been the theme of a song sung by Aristis, and this Aristis is presented as a singer skilful and professional enough to have taken part in the Pythian contests of poetry and music, held at Delphi. The conclusion that we can then draw from this mention is that the song of the apprentice pastoral singer, Simichidas-Theocritus, is being depicted as a performance worthy of a singer who performs at Delphi.

The two songs of *Id.* 7 also offer a valuable example of how Theocritus succeeds in including even the most traditional form of the sym-

¹⁶ Cf. Fantuzzi (2000).

¹⁷ Cf. Krevans (1983) 214–215 and Hunter (1996) 26.

potic song, and many of its themes, within the field of his 'new' bucolic poetry. That the symposium represents a focal, formative experience for Greek culture, or rather for Greek society, in the archaic and classical periods, is by now a widely accepted thesis thanks to an extensive bibliography which extends as far back as the end of the 19th century.¹⁸ The role of sympotic poetry in the Hellenistic age is quite a different issue, which to a certain extent remains enigmatic.¹⁹ In his book on Callimachus, Cameron advances the hypothesis, which in my mind seems reductive, that much Hellenistic poetry is sympotic poetry:²⁰ his argument, based on a few and rather slim testimonia of convivial poetry, like the *skolia* from Elephantina,²¹ presupposes an assumption that in itself is quite right, i.e. that the Hellenistic epigram inherited many of the functions and traditions of archaic elegiac and lyric poetry; Cameron then, however, does not distinguish that which is really sympotic in Hellenistic eroto-sympotic epigram from that which is only meta-sympotic, and furthermore he fails to deal with the question how much in Hellenistic sympotic poetry is real, and how much, on the other hand, represents a 'literary' and artificial imitation of the archaic sympotic tradition.

If it is true that the innovation which changed bucolic poetry from an expression of popular culture into a real literary genre ought to be attributed to Theocritus, then it should be interesting to examine the position of such an influential element of Greek literature as the sym-

¹⁸ I refer to Reitzenstein (1893). Within the scope of this bibliography, I will limit myself here to recalling Rossi (1983) and Vetta (1992) 177–218, together with Vetta (1983) and Murray (1990). I believe that two opinions expressed, respectively, by Rossi and by Vetta may fittingly sum up the importance of the symposium on the cultural, political, and social levels. Rossi writes: "from the 7th to the 5th cent., ... the symposium is the place of performance of *all* monodic poetry, and consequently the relationship with what we call literature is very close: the history of lyric poetry is the history of the symposium" (p. 49); by lyric poetry, he obviously means not only monodic lyric poetry, but also elegiac and iambic poetry. On another level, Vetta affirms: "the symposium is the experience by means of which particular dominant groups mark their difference from other social and political categories" (pp. 178–179). Apart from the evolutions which characterise the history of the symposium from the archaic period to the classical age, I believe that these two affirmations capture the essence and the peculiarity of the symposium in these periods.

¹⁹ To put it concisely, as does Sonnino (2003), this poetry cannot disregard the "complex problem of the relationship between the Hellenistic symposium and contemporary *Buchliteratur*" (p. 283).

²⁰ Cameron (1995) 76–77.

²¹ *Ed. princeps* by U. v. Wilamowitz and W. Schubart, in *Berliner Klassikertexte*, V.2, 1907, pp. 56–63; cf. *CA* pp. 190–192. For a detailed analysis of these texts, see Pellizer and Tedeschi (1983), Ferrari (1988).

posium within this new poetic genre. The operation transferring the town-dweller to the rustic environment is particularly clear in *Id.* 7. In Lycidas' *boukoliasmos*, a *propemptikon* for his beloved Ageanax who is about to set sail for Mytilene, the poet describes how he will celebrate on the day of his beloved's arrival at his destination (ll. 63–89). The occasion of the celebration is clearly offered in the form of a symposium. Lycidas, his head crowned with a garland of flowers (ll. 63–64 ἀνήτινον ἢ ῥοδόεντα / ἢ καὶ λευκοῖων στέφανον περὶ κρατὶ φυλάσσων, “wreathing my brows with anise, roses, or white stocks”), drinks some Ptelean wine (l. 65 τὸν Πτελεατικὸν οἶνον); somebody roasts broad beans for him on a fire (l. 66 κύαμον δέ τις ἐν πυρὶ φρυξεῖ). The setting of the symposium is undoubtedly rustic: the bed where Lycidas is lying, which is one cubit high, is made of endive, asphodel and curly parsley (ll. 67–68 γὰρ στιβάς ἐσσεῖται πεπυκασμένα ἔστ' ἐπὶ πᾶχυν / κνύζα τ' ἀσφοδέλω τε πολυγνάμπτω τε σελίνῳ, “and cubit-high will my couch be strewn with fleabane and asphodel and curling celery”), two shepherds are there playing their pipes (ll. 71–72 αὐλησεῦντι δέ μοι δύο ποιμένες, εἷς μὲν Ἀχαρνέυς, / εἷς δὲ Λυκωπίτας, “and two shepherds will pipe for me, one from Acharnae, and from Lycope one”), and the singer, too, as is clear from his name, Tityrus (l. 72), is undoubtedly a shepherd.

Another feature typical of the pastoral environment is the presence of only two protagonists at the symposium: Tityrus, who sings, and Lycidas, who listens, behave in accordance with a dualism that seems to be peculiar to pastoral performances, as is clear already in *Id.* 1. In this case, the pastoral setting has led to the loss of one of the fundamental characteristics of the urban symposium, i.e. the plurality of its protagonists. Furthermore, the contents of the two songs that Tityrus sings are exquisitely bucolic: in the first (ll. 73–77), he sings of the sufferings of Daphnis, who is in love with Xenea, a theme analogous to that sung by Thyrsis in *Id.* 1; in the second one (ll. 78–89), he recalls a story in which the protagonist is a goatherd—to be identified, despite Radt's opinion,²² with the mythical Comatas mentioned immediately afterwards—who had been locked alive inside a chest by his evil master, but was able to survive because he was nourished by bees that were attracted by the nectar that the Muses had poured onto his lips. Lycidas' song finishes with the name of the mythical goatherd Comatas, who, even if he were

²² Radt (1971) 254–255.

a different character from the goatherd celebrated in Tityrus' song, was, however, the protagonist of a similar episode (ll. 83–89).

In short, a large amount of space is dedicated, in the song of Lycidas, a shepherd, to the description of a pastoral symposium, which is in turn the occasion for the performance of two songs with pastoral themes. Theocritus appears to have wished to give his poem a compositional structure similar to that of Russian nesting dolls, in order to emphasise the bucolic nature of this symposium. It is significant that Tityrus' two sympotic songs are bucolic songs *par excellence*: the protagonist of the first is the cowherd Daphnis, the archetypal hero of bucolic poetry, while the second celebrates the mythical goatherd Comatas, whose song is directly inspired by the Muses. This is a striking case of both the literary elaboration of bucolic poetry and the metaliterary character of the symposium.

A twofold reflection stems from this observation: on the one hand, Theocritus presents us with a picture of the bucolic symposium in which the themes of the songs are bucolic, or rather, archetypally bucolic, as if to say that these songs already belonged to a patrimony of folklore that existed before he created the bucolic genre. On the other hand, Theocritus, by means of this kind of reconstruction, actually describes a situation in which the symposium proves to be one of the social settings for the poetry of folklore that he assumes, or imagines to be, the source of his genre. Here Theocritus is constructing an archaeology of the bucolic symposium, as if to camouflage the procedure that he himself had carried out, namely that of transferring the sympotic occasion from the town to the countryside. As Daphnis and Comatas are archetypal heroes of bucolic poetry—the first subjects of songs, according to a doxographic tradition going back at least as far as Timaeus—this is a sort of aetiology of bucolic poetry, and of its capacity as sympotic poetry as well.

While the bucolic setting of the rustic symposium described in Lycidas' song is characterised by its exceptional effect of bucolic realism, the nature of the other rustic symposium described at the end of *Id.* 7 is completely different. Before arriving at Phrasidamus' farm, where the closing symposium of the poem is to be held, Simichidas-Theocritus has the opportunity to submit to Lycidas' attention what he considers to be his best song and states, most unconvincingly, that he composed it while pasturing his flocks on the mountainside (see above, pp. 61–62). In reality, this is an exquisitely urban composition, both in its setting and theme: Simichidas-Theocritus sings of the unhappy love of his per-

sonal friend, Aratus, for the handsome Philinus, but this love is enacted in a manifestly urban setting, characterised by practices typical of city life like the *komos*, the *paraklausithyron* and the *thyraulia*.

After Lycidas has given him his shepherd's crook as a sign of his investiture as a pastoral poet (ll. 129–130) and gone on his way, Simichidas-Theocritus, together with his friends, finally arrives at Phrasidamus' farm (ll. 131–157), where the feast in honour of Demeter is being held. This feast is, in reality, a symposium, as is evident from the fact that the seal removed from the neck of the wine-jars is four years old (l. 147, τετράενης δὲ πίθων ἀπελύετο κρατὸς ἄλειφαρ, “and the four-year seal was loosened from the head of the wine-jars”). But it is a rustic symposium, taking place in the open air: the participants lie down on beds of mastic branches and vine leaves (ll. 132–134, ἔν τε βαθείαις / ἁδείας σχοίνοιο χαμυνίσιν ἐκλίνθημες / ἔν τε νεοτμάτοις γεγαυθότες οἶναρέοις, “and laid ourselves down rejoicing on deep couches of sweet rush and in the fresh-stripped vine-leaves”), just as at the symposium in honour of Ageanax, celebrated previously in song by Lycidas. Indeed, in this case, the rustic setting of the symposium presents the opportunity for an enthusiastic description of a luxuriant nature, with its pervasive beauty and lushness, amid a symphony of sounds: the gentle rustling of poplars and elms (ll. 135–136, πολλαὶ δ' ἄμιν ὑπερθε κατὰ κρατὸς δονέοντο / αἰγείοι πελέαι τε, “many a poplar and elm murmured above our heads”), the babble of the spring sacred to the Nymphs (ll. 136–137, τὸ δ' ἐγγύθεν ἱερὸν ὕδωρ / Νυμφᾶν ἐξ ἀντροῖο κατειβόμενον κελάρυξε, “and near at hand the sacred water from the cave of the Nymphs fell plashing”), the chirruping of the cicadas (ll. 138–139, τοὶ δὲ ποτὶ σκιαραῖς ὀροδαμνίσιν αἰθαλίωνες / τέττιγες λαλαγεῦντες ἔχον πόνον, “on the shady boughs the dusky cicadas were busy with their chatter”), the trilling of the nightingale (ll. 139–140, ἃ δ' ὀλολυγὼν / τηλόθεν ἐν πυκναῖσι βάτων τρύζεσκεν ἀκάνθαις, “and the nightingale far off cried in the dense thorn-brake”),²³ the singing of the larks and the finches (l. 141, αἶιδον κόρυδοι καὶ ἀκανθίδες), the moaning of the turtle-dove (l. 141, ἔστενε τρυγὼν), and the bees buzzing in their humming about the springs (l. 142, πωτῶντο ξοῦθαι περὶ πίδακας ἀμφὶ μέλισσαι). The smell of rich harvest and fruit is everywhere (l. 143, πάντ' ὥσδε θέρους μάλα πίονος, ὥσδε δ' ὀπώρας); the ground is covered with pears and

²³ At l. 139, I accept the interpretation of ὀλολυγὼν as a “nightingale” proposed by White (1979) 9–16, even if this meaning creates some difficulties in connection with the following verb τρύζεσκεν (l. 140).

apples (ll. 144–145, ὄχλαι μὲν παρ ποσσί, παρὰ πλευραῖσι δὲ μάλα / δαιψιλέως ἀμῖν ἐκυλίνδεται, “pears at our feet and apples at our side were rolling plentifully”), and all around the branches are weighed to the ground with their burden of plums (ll. 145–146, τοὶ δ’ ἐκέχυντο / ὄρπακες βραβύλοισι καταβρίθοντες ἔραζε). This is one of the finest descriptions of a *locus amoenus*, one in which there is a continuous medley of sounds, smells and colours that blend into each other to create a single whole, making Phrasidamus’ farm the bucolic setting *par excellence*. It is almost as if Simichidas-Theocritus has decided to outdo himself as a pastoral poet by describing his ideal of a rustic landscape, immediately after his investiture by Lycidas.²⁴ But let us return for a moment to the wine that is being offered on this occasion. Its fragrance induces the poet to ask the Nymphs of Castalia if it is the same wine as that which was offered to Heracles by Chiron in Pholus’ cave (ll. 148–150), or whether it is like the wine that led Polyphemus to dance in his cave (ll. 151–155). By mentioning these two mythical episodes, both of which are significantly set in a rustic context (l. 149, κατὰ λάνον ἀντρον, “in the rocky cave”, and l. 153, κατ’ αὔλια, “among the sheepfolds”), Theocritus seems to suggest their relevance to a mythical prehistoric ideal of the bucolic world on the one hand, and on the other their substantial remoteness from the peaceful atmosphere which the poet intends to emphasise in his role both as author and participant of *Id.* 7.²⁵

There is another operation at work transferring the urban symposium to a rustic environment in *Id.* 14. This is undoubtedly a mime, like *Id.* 2, *The Enchanter*, and *Id.* 15, *The Syracusans*; but even if most modern critics consider it to be an urban mime, in view of the fact that the two protagonists, Aeschinas and Thyonichus, are certainly town-dwellers, I believe we should not underestimate the fact that, in his answer to Thyonichus’ question about whether there is anything new (l. 11), Aeschinas relates an episode that took place during a symposium held in an undoubtedly rustic setting. On the basis of the setting of this episode, which is structurally central in the economy of the idyll, it is perhaps more accurate to consider this mime as not purely urban, but rather as a song in which aspects of both town and country blend together, creating a composition that is more complex and yet includes distinctive characteristics of both. Let us look more closely at the section in which Theocritus describes the symposium (ll. 12–43):

²⁴ Cf. Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 147.

²⁵ Cf. Fantuzzi (1995a) 33–35.

ΑΙ. Ὠργεῖος κήγων καὶ ὁ Θεσσαλὸς ἵπποδιώκτας
 ἄγῃς καὶ Κλεύνικος ἐπίνομος ὁ στρατιώτας
 ἐν χώρῳ παρ' ἐμίν. δύο μὲν κατέκοψα νεοσσὼς
 θηλάζοντά τε χοῖρον, ἀνῶξα δὲ Βίβλινον αὐτοῖς
 εὐώδη τετόρων ἐτέων σχεδὸν ὥς ἀπὸ λανῶ
 βολβός τις, κοχλίας, ἐξαιρέθη· ἥς πότος ἀδύς.
 ἦδη δὲ προϊόντος ἔδοξ' ἐπιχεῖσθαι ἄκρατον
 ὥτινος ἦθελ' ἕκαστος· ἔδει μόνον ὥτινος εἰπεῖν.
 ἄμες μὲν φωνεῦντες ἐπίνομες, ὥς ἐδέδοκτο·
 ἃ δ' οὐδὲν παρεόντος ἐμεῦ. τίν' ἔχειν με δοκεῖς νῶν;
 “οὐ φθελῆξῃ; λύκον εἶδες;” ἐπαιξέ τις. “ὥς σοφός” εἶπεν,
 κήφλέγετ'· εὐμαρέως κεν ἅπ' αὐτᾶς καὶ λύχνον ἄψας.
 ἔστι Λύκος, Λύκος ἐστί, Λάβα τῷ γείτονος υἱός,
 εὐμάκης, ἀπαλός, πολλοῖς δοκῶν καλὸς ἦμεν·
 τοῦτω τὸν κλύμενον κατεφρύγετο τήνον ἔρωτα.
 χάμῃν τοῦτο δι' ὧτὸς ἐγεντό ποχ' ἄσυχᾶ οὕτως·
 οὐ μὰν ἐξήταξα, μάταν εἰς ἄνδρα γενειῶν.
 ἦδη δ' ὦν πόσιος τοῖ τέσσαρες ἐν βάθει ἦμες,
 χῶ Λαρισαῖος “τὸν ἐμὸν Λύκον” ᾄδεν ἅπ' ἀρχᾶς,
 Θεσσαλικόν τι μέλισμα, κακαὶ φρένες· ἃ δὲ Κυνίσκα
 ἔκλαεν ἐξαπίνας θαλερώτερον ἢ παρὰ ματρί
 παρθένος ἐξαετὴς κόλπῳ ἐπιθυμήσασα.
 τᾶμος ἐγὼ, τὸν ἴσας τύ, Θυώνιχε, πῦξ ἐπὶ κόρρας
 ἦλασα, καλλαν αὐθις ἀνείρυσας δέ ἐ πέπλῳ·
 “ἔξω ἀποιχεο θᾶσσον. ἐμὸν κακόν, οὐ τοι ἀρέσκω;
 ἄλλος τοι γλυκίων ὑποκόλπιος; ἄλλον ἰοῖσα
 θάλπε φίλον. τήνῃ τεὰ δάκρυα; μᾶλα ρεόντω”.
 μάστακα δοῖσα τέκνοισιν ὑπωροφίοισι χελιδῶν
 ἄψορρον ταχινὰ πέτεται βίον ἄλλον ἀγείρειν·
 ὠκυτέρα μαλακᾶς ἀπὸ δίφρακος ἔπτετο τήνα
 ἰθὺ δι' ἀμφιθύρῳ καὶ δικλίδος, ᾗ πόδες ἄγον.
 αἰνὸς θην λέγεται τις “ἔβα ποκὰ ταῦρος ἄν' ὕλαν”.

(Aeschinas) The Argive, and I, and Agis the Thessalian trainer, and Cle-
 unicus the soldier-man were making merry at my place in the country. I
 had killed a brace of chickens and a sucking pig, and opened them some
 Bibline, as fragrant almost, at four years old, as the day it was pressed.
 I had got out an onion or so, and snails. It was a jolly drinking-party.
 When it was getting forward, we voted that each should toast his fancy
 at neat; only he must say who his fancy was. But while we were call-
 ing the names and drinking, as agreed, she said nothing though I was
 there. How do you suppose I liked that? “Can’t you speak? Have you
 seen a wolf?”, said somebody in jest. “How clever you are”, said she,
 and lit up—you could have lighted a taper at her cheeks, easily. There is
 a Wolf; a Wolf there is, neighbour Labes’ boy. A tall, soft-skinned fellow
 that many think good-looking. It was for him, the precious passion that
 had Cynisca on the grill. The thing came to my ears one day, just on the

quiet, but I never looked into it, so little good it's been to grow to shaving age. Anyhow, by now the four of us were deep in our cups, and the Larisa chap sang "My Wolf" straight through—some Thessalian catch, the mischievous brute; and Cynisca suddenly began to cry, worse than a six-year-old that cries for her mother's lap. Then I—you know what I am like, Thyonichus—got her with my fist on the temple, and then one more tearing her skirts off, "Go away as fast as you can", said I. "Plague that you are, I don't please you then? You prefer some other darling, do you? Go and cuddle your other friend. Your tears are for him, are they? Then let them flow as big as apples". The swallow brings her nestlings beneath the eaves a morsel and is off again like a flash to gather a fresh supply, but quicker than the swallow Cynisca flew from her soft seat straight through the porch and house-door, wherever her feet carried her. "The bull once went to the wood", so runs the tale.

The participants in the symposium are thus four men and one woman: besides Aeschinas, who is relating the episode, there are three friends of his—an Argive who remains anonymous, a Thessalian horseman whose name is Agis, the soldier Cleunicus (ll. 12–13), and Cynisca, the woman with whom Aeschinas is in love. In l. 14 the expression ἐν χώρῳ, "in the country" immediately makes it clear that the symposium is being held in the countryside; this setting is highlighted by the fact that two chickens and a young pig had been killed for the banquet preceding the symposium (ll. 14–15). A wine of excellent quality is served, as we can know from the specification that it comes from Byblos, and is four years old (ll. 15–16).²⁶ The wine is accompanied by some 'snacks', namely onions and snails (l. 17). At a certain point, as in the tradition of the archaic and classical symposium, a toast is proposed—in this case it is made with pure wine—in honour of the beloved (ll. 18–19); this custom is found in many epigrams in the *Anthologia Palatina*, e.g. in Callimachus, *AP* 12.51 = *HE* 1063ff. and in Meleager, *AP* 5.136 = *HE* 4222ff. All the other participants drink in honour of somebody, but Cynisca remains silent, even in the presence of Aeschinas (ll. 20–21). And moreover, when one of the guests provokes her, perhaps unintentionally, by asking her if she has seen a wolf (l. 22), thinking of the popular belief, mentioned also by Plato (*Resp.* 1.336d), that if a wolf saw a man first, the man would be struck dumb, the girl blushes (l. 23) and in her inability to control her reaction thus arouses some suspicion. Aeschinas realises that the rumours he has

²⁶ As regards the problems concerning the determination of the area of origin of this wine, about which the ancients were already uncertain, see the comment by Gow (1952) vol. 2, 250–251.

heard about the existence of a rival by the name of Wolf, a tall, gentle, handsome young man, may be well-founded (ll. 24–28). The situation is complicated and things come to a head when, at the end of the symposium, Agis, the Thessalian horseman from Larisa, begins to sing—this time with a clearly malign intent, as is clear from the epithet κακαὶ φρένες, “mischievous brute”, used of him (l. 31)—a song from his homeland, which begins with the words “my wolf” (ll. 29–31). Cynisca starts crying, Thyonichus beats her and throws her out (ll. 31–38).²⁷ The girl runs away faster than a swallow that flies off, after feeding her young, to go look for more food (ll. 39–43).

Apart from their chronological order, which is hard to pin down, the analysis of the three symposia proposed here would almost appear to trace an imaginary set of possibilities. When he wanted to include the reality of the symposium in the new poetic genre of bucolic poetry, Theocritus limited himself, in *Id.* 14, to transferring urban themes and characters to a country setting, whereas in Lycidas’ song in *Id.* 7 he describes a real rustic symposium, in which the characters, setting and themes are all realistically bucolic. And, in the final part of *Id.* 7 in his description of the symposium at Phrasidamus’ farm, where, not surprisingly, the character Simichidas-Theocritus is the narrative ‘I’, he outlines his ideal of a bucolic symposium.

Thus far we have seen that the image of the bucolic singer proposed by Theocritus in his pastoral songs is fashioned by a subtle balance between the recovery of the traditional nature of bucolic poetry as an oral poetry of folklore on the one hand, and the use of elements that had characterised the image of poetry and its settings (the symposium, for example) in archaic and classical literature on the other. As regards this latter aspect in particular, a parallel operation, which is particularly delicate and successful, can be witnessed in the bucolicisation of the *komos* in *Id.* 3 and 11. The characterisation of *Id.* 3 as a *komos* with serenade is explicitly stated by the κωμάσδω, “I go to serenade”, with which the poem opens. However, it is immediately clear that the setting of this *komos* is not urban at all, as was normally the case for the *komos* / *paraklausithyron*, but rather bucolic: the protagonist of the *komos* is a goatherd (l. 19, τὸν αἰπόλον); the landscape is rural—in ll. 1–2, ταῖ δέ

²⁷ At l. 36 I read, together with the Papyrus of Antinoe, ἀποίχεο, instead of the ἀποίχετο or ἀπώχετο of medieval tradition, with the consequent correction in l. 35 of the ἀνειρύσασα δὲ πέπλωσ of the mss. to ἀνειρύσας δὲ ἔπέπλω, as proposed by Gallavotti (1993).

μοι αἶγες / βόσκονται κατ' ὄρος, "my goats graze on the hill", there are goats grazing on the mountainside; the gift that the protagonist has prepared for Amaryllis, the girl with whom he is in love, includes not only a twin-bearing white goat (l. 34, λευκὰν διδυματόκον αἶγα), but also ten apples (l. 10, ἦνιδε τοι δέκα μᾶλα φέρω); these are explained, with meticulously deictic precision, to have come from a specific tree that belongs to the surrounding rural landscape (ll. 10–11, τῆν' ὧθε καθεῖλον / ὧ μ' ἐκέλευ καθελεῖν τύ, "I gathered from the very place you bade me"). But above all, the place where Amaryllis lives is not a house, but a cave (ll. 6 and 13, ἄντρον, "cave"), and, as a result, the material element at the basis of the *paraklausithyron*, i.e. the door, is strangely missing,²⁸ and is substituted by, if anything, a curtain of ivy and ferns (l. 14, τὸν κισσὸν διαδύς καὶ τὰν πτέρυν). What is more, the goatherd's threat to lie all night in front of the door of his beloved, the so-called *thyraulia*,²⁹ consists, in this case, of the real prospect of being torn to pieces by wolves (l. 53, τοὶ λύκοι ὧδέ μ' ἔδονται).

At this point, we may wonder whether the explicit allusion to the pastoral reality in at least two of the mythical *exempla* proposed by the goatherd by way of convincing Amaryllis to accept his love (ll. 43–44, τὰν ἀγέλαν χῶ μάντις ἀπ' Ὀθρυος ἄγε Μελάμπους / ἐς Πύλον, "the seer Melampus, too, from Othrys brought the herd to Pylus", and 46–47, τὰν δὲ καλὰν Κυθήρειαν ἐν ὧρεσι μῆλα νομεύων / οὐχ οὕτως Ὠδωνίς ἐπὶ πλέον ἄγαγε λύσσας;, "and did not Adonis, as he fed his sheep upon the hills, drive the fair Cythereia to such frenzy that even in death she puts him not from her breast?") perhaps constitutes an essentially fictitious testimony to the existence of a repertoire of pastoral songs based on love themes, like the repertoire presupposed by the songs about Daphnis in *Id.* 1 and 7 and about Comatas, also in *Id.* 7. The existence of this repertoire of mythological love stories with a bucolic setting is fixed in the manneristic bucolic poetry of Theocritus' imitators, as is clear from the paradigmatic mention of Proteus, the guardian of seals in *Id.* 8.51–52 and from the manneristically amplified mention of the catalogue of love affairs between divinities and shepherds found in ll. 34–41 of *Id.* 20.

Id. 11 can also be included in the category of *paraklausithyron*, in the sense that Polyphemus' love-song on the sea-shore might be read as a serenade sung before the place where his beloved Galatea, a Nereid,

²⁸ As regards the Greek *paraklausithyron*, Copley (1956) 1–27 is still useful.

²⁹ For some significant examples of *thyraulia*, see *AP* 5.23; 5.150; 5.189; 12.90.

habitually resides, in his paradoxical, and, so to speak, ‘inverted’ attempt to convince her not so much to receive him into her dwelling-place, as is stated in ll. 54–57, but rather to lure her out onto the dry land (ll. 42–48 and 63–66).³⁰ If we accept this interpretation, we may then observe, as was noted for *Id.* 3, the transposition of various elements of the *paraklausithyron* from the urban to the rustic environment. Not only is the shepherd’s activity underlined in the presentation of Polyphemus (ll. 12–13, πολλάκι τὰ ὄιες ποτὶ τῷλιον αὐταὶ ἀπὴνθον / χλωρᾶς ἐκ βοτάνας, “many a time would his sheep come of their own accord back from the green pastures to his fold”), but there is a typically rustic flavour, at the beginning of the Cyclops’ song, both in the description of Galatea’s behaviour as she escapes from her admirer like a sheep fleeing at the sight of a wolf (l. 24, φεύγεις δ’ ὥσπερ ὄις πολὺν λύκον ἀθρήσασα), and, above all, in the praise of the young maiden, which is based entirely on similes of a pastoral-rustic nature (ll. 19–21, ὦ Λευκὰ Γαλάτεια, τί τὸν φιλέοντ’ ἀποβάλλῃ, / λευκοτέρα πακτᾶς ποτιδεῖν, ἀπαλωτέρα ἄρνός, / μόσχῳ γανροτέρα, φιαρωτέρα ὄμφακος ὠμᾶς; “O white Galatea, why do you repulse your lover—whiter than curd to look on, softer than the lamb, more skittish than the calf, sleeker than the unripe grape?”), even if it is not without explicit reminiscences of Sappho and Anacreon.³¹ In my opinion, the bucolicisation of the environment to which the Cyclops hopes to draw Galatea is particularly radical, in view of its having explicit characteristics of a *locus amoenus* (ll. 45–48, ἐντὶ δάφναι τηνεῖ, ἐντὶ ῥαδινὰ κυπάρισσοι, / ἔστι μέλας κισσός, ἔστ’ ἄμπελος ἅ γλυκύκαρπος, / ἔστι ψυχρόν ὕδωρ, τό μοι ἅ πολυδένδρεος Αἴτνα / λευκᾶς ἐκ χιόνος ποτὸν ἀμβρόσιον προῖητι, “there are bays and slender cypresses; there is dark ivy, and the sweet-fruited vine, and water cold, which wooded Etna puts forth for me from her white snowfields, a draught divine”). Even if these verses, spoken by the Cyclops, appear to be totally paradoxical, in that they reveal the whole of his clumsiness in his attempts to lure a Nereid onto terra firma, they may, however, be given a metaliterary interpretation and so offer once again, as in the case of the ending of *Id.* 7, a reiterated affirmation by Theocritus of the ideally pleasurable nature of the bucolic setting.

In conclusion, the above considerations would appear to confirm the initial hypothesis of this paper: the literary transposition of the

³⁰ Du Quesnay (1979) 46–47; cf. Hunter (1999) 229.

³¹ Hunter (1999) 229–230.

anthropological reality of pastoral songs, and the transfer to the field of bucolic poetry of realities that were not originally bucolic and which, on the contrary, partially reveal a certain straining for realism in the very process of being made bucolic, lie at the basis of Theocritus' poetic choice to make the rustic and pastoral world the hub of a genre, a genre of which he represents himself as the proud *heuretes*.³²

³² English translation from Italian by J. Hanink, R. Packham, and T.D. Papanghelis. Theocritus' translations are from Gow (1952), with occasional modifications.

MAGIC, MEDICINE AND EROS IN THE PROLOGUE TO THEOCRITUS' *ID.* 11

CHRISTOPHER A. FARAONE

At the beginning of *Id.* 11, Theocritus sings the following hexametrical verses to his friend Nicias (ll. 1–6):¹

Οὐδὲν ποττὸν ἔρωτα πεφύκει φάρμακον ἄλλο,
Νικία, οὔτ' ἔγγριστον, ἐμὴν δοκεῖ, οὔτ' ἐπίπαστον,
ἢ ταὶ Περίδες· κοῦφον δέ τι τοῦτο καὶ ἄδύ
γίNET' ἐπ' ἀνθρώποις. εὐρεῖν δ' οὐ ῥᾶδιόν ἐστι.
γινώσκειν δ' οἶμαί τυ καλῶς ἱατρὸν ἐόντα
καὶ ταῖς ἐννέα δὴ πεφίλημένον ἔξοχα Μοῖσαις.

Against *eros* there is no other *pharmakon*, Nicias, neither ointment, it seems to me, nor salve, except the Muses; light is this *pharmakon* and sweet for mortals, but it is not easy to discover. But I think that you know this well, since you are a physician and indeed loved in excess by the nine Muses.

These lines and the rest of the prologue have generated much interest among scholars of Hellenistic poetry because they are used in a rather sophisticated manner to embed at an ironic distance the “bucolic” song of the lovesick Cyclops that occupies most of the poem.² The implicit boast of the poet, moreover, about the superior power of his own craft (hexametrical poetry) over that of his love-sick friend Nicias (medicine), clearly has a programmatic ring to it, as does the explicit connection made in the very next line between the two Sicilian singers: Theocritus and his fellow Sicilian Polyphemus (l. 7: ὁ Κύκλωψ ὁ παρ' ἡμῶν).³

Commentators nonetheless continue to disagree over the precise claims being made here. Some suggest, for example, that Theocritus presents both himself and Polyphemus as lovesick Sicilian poets, who compose songs simply as entertainment that will distract themselves from their present cares,⁴ in contrast to Nicias, the doctor, for whom the poet provides specific medical analogies in the first two lines:

¹ I use the text of Gow (1952) and my own translations throughout.

² See, e.g., Hopkinson (1988) 149–150 and Goldhill (1991).

³ Hunter (1999) 219.

⁴ For example, Erbse (1965) 232–236, Manuwald (1990), Deuse (1990) and Hunter (1999) 219.

“For (i.e. the disease of) *eros* there is no other medicine, Nicias, neither ointment ... nor salve”.⁵ This reading stems, in part, from the high probability that Theocritus is responding to the famous dithyramb of Philoxenus, who similarly framed Polyphemus’ song as a healing event.⁶ Other readers suggest that Theocritus is alluding more explicitly to current theories about the cathartic or healing power of music, especially against the passions,⁷ or that the embedded song is treated both as a curative draught and as a love-potion.⁸ In large part this disagreement stems from the notorious ambiguity of the word *pharmakon*, which can be rendered as “herb” (medicinal or poisonous) or as “incantation” (beneficial or destructive). There is also the additional puzzle that although Nicias, the addressee of the poem, is described as both doctor and poet, there is far more emphasis on his status as a poet, which takes up an entire hexametrical verse and is rhetorically emphasized by the numbering of the Muses (“loved in excess by the nine Muses”).

The recent publication and study of a series of inscribed lead amulets from Magna Graecia and Crete can, however, provide a new way of looking at the claims of the prologue, because the hexametrical incantations inscribed upon these amulets make boasts that are similar in content and phrasing to the opening verses of the prologue to *Id.* 11. These similarities suggest that Theocritus presents the Cyclops as the “first discoverer” of an ancient Sicilian form of protective song or incantation and that he invokes the Greek idea of *pharmakon* as “incantation”, usually hexametrical, that is also employed in the poetry of Empedocles, another Sicilian poet who sang in hexameters. I shall argue, in fact, that Theocritus playfully contrasts this old Sicilian tradition of protective incantations with similar claims made by medical doctors like Nicias, who in Theocritus’ day had begun to treat erotic seizure as a medical pathology worthy of their professional attention.⁹ Theocritus, however, seems to imagine the danger not as a disease (*eros*), which can be cured by medicine, but rather as the “demon” Eros, who must continually be warded off or kept at bay by means of an incantation.

⁵ See again Hunter (1999) 224.

⁶ One fragment from the lost poem (*PMG* 822), preserved in Σ Theocr. 11.1–3b (p. 241 Wendel), says that the Cyclops sent a message to Galatea (by way of some dolphins) “that he was healing his *eros* with the Muses” (ταῖς Μούσαις τὸν ἔρωτα ἀλείπει), which suggested that in Philoxenus’ poem Polyphemus used poetry as an *ἄκος*.

⁷ For example, Meillier (1982), Farr (1991) 481, and Cozzoli (1994) 95–110.

⁸ Goldhill (1991) 254–255.

⁹ Hunter (1999) 224.

1. *The Cretan-West Greek tradition of protective incantations*

Let me begin with two verses from a hexametrical incantation inscribed on one of the lead amulets mentioned above, this one from Phalasarna, Crete (c. 400 BC):¹⁰

... οὐ με καταχρίσ[τ]ω **δ]ηλήσεται οὐτ'** ἐπενίξτ[ω]
οὔτε ποτῶ [οὔ]τ' ἐπαγωγῇ

... shall not harm me with ointment or with application [Maas; "ghost?" Jordan] or with drink or with incantation".

This amulet was apparently designed to protect a group of houses in Crete at the end of the 5th century.¹¹ It is comprised of a series of disjointed incantations, most of them demonstrably hexametrical. The boast quoted here appears to have been more popular than the other sections of the Cretan amulet, for it shows up in altered form on two other fragmentary lead amulets from Selinus and Locri of roughly the same date or earlier:¹²

οὐκ ἄν δειλήσ[ε]ται' {οὐδεις} οὐδ' αἱ πολυφάρ[μακοι] (?) (Selinus)
οὐ κα δαλήσαιτο οὐδ' αἱ πολυφάρμακοι (?) (Locri)

... may X not harm us(?), nor may the women who know many *pharmaka* (harm us) ...

Although both of these Western Greek examples are poorly preserved, they share some striking similarities to the Cretan amulet: all are concerned with protective magic, all are composed in hexameters and all use very similar wording (see the portions in bold above) to identify a plurality of dangers that will be kept away or otherwise neutralized by the amulet.

Since one of these three late-classical amulets was found in Sicily it would be easy enough to invoke Theocritus' Syracusan origin as a likely source for his knowledge of such chants, and it may well be that he is recalling some hexametrical incantation or even a nursery rhyme sung over his head as a child. Indeed, the final two lines of *Idyll* 9—a

¹⁰ Guarducci (1939) 223–225 no. 7 gives brief comments and bibliography *ad loc.* For earlier work, much valuable information can still be got from the discussions of Wünsch (1900) 73–85. See Jordan (1992) 191–194, for the text and translation I give here; the uncorrected text is: οὐ με καταχρίσ[τ]ω δ]ηλήσεται οὐτ' ἐπενίξτ[ω] / οὔτε ποτῶ [οὔ]τ' ἐπαγωγῇ.

¹¹ The opening line reads in the translation of Jordan (1992) 192: "I bid you flee from these houses of ours ...".

¹² Jordan (2000) 100.

late Hellenistic imitation of Theocritus also written in Doric Greek—seem to echo even more closely the examples from Magna Graecia (*Id.* 9.35–36):

... τόσσον ἐμὶν Μοῖσαι φίλαι. οὕς γὰρ ὄρευντι
γαθεῦσαι, τῶς δ' οὔτι ποτῶ δαλήσατο Κίρκη.

... so dear to me are the Muses. For whomever they look upon with smiles, these in no way will Circe harm with a potion.

Commentators on this epilogue to *Id.* 9 have noted that the sentiment, which seems to echo the famous claim at the end of the prologue to Callimachus' *Aitia*, emphasizes the parallels between magic and poetry much more clearly than the prologue to *Id.* 11 does,¹³ but now (with the help of these newly discovered amulets) we can see that the poet who composed these verses must have known the traditional incantation, for his οὔτι ποτῶ echoes the wording of the Cretan tablet (οὔτε ποτῶ) and his mention of Circe, one of the two most famous experts in *pharmaka* in antiquity (her sister Medea is the other),¹⁴ seems to recall the texts from Magna Graecia, which both end with variations of the same boast: "... may X not harm (us?) nor may the women who know many *pharmaka* (harm us) ...". Thus it is tempting to suggest that in *Id.* 11, which frames the tale of how the poet's Sicilian countryman invented the first *pharmakon*, Theocritus calls to mind both the form and language of a traditional protective incantation that was apparently circulating in Selinus and Locri for at least a century and a half before he lived.

But, as it usually turns out with Theocritus, the situation is more complicated than it first appears, because echoes of this incantatory boast also appear in another, earlier literary text, the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter*, in the scene where the goddess—disguised as an old woman looking for employment as a nurse for a young child—also boasts about her knowledge of protective magic (ll. 227–230):¹⁵

θρέψω, κοῦ μιν ἔολπα κακοφραδίῃσι τιθήνης
οὔτ' ἄρ' ἐπηλυσίη δηλήσεται οὔθ' Ὑποταμνόν·
οἷδα γὰρ ἀντίτομον μέγα φέρτερον Ὑλοτόμοιο
οἷδα δ' ἐπηλυσίης πολυπήμονος ἐσθλὸν ἐρυσμόν.

I will nurse him, and I do not expect—through any weak-mindedness of his nurse—that witchcraft or the "Undercutter" will harm him, for

¹³ See also Bermsdorff, this volume, pp. 199–200.

¹⁴ See, e.g., Theocr. 2.15–16, with the comments of Gow (1955) *ad loc.*

¹⁵ Faraone (2001).

I know an antidote far stronger than the “Woodcutter” and I know an excellent defense against woeful witchcraft.

Scholars have long noted that in her boast the goddess seems to imitate a magical charm, both in its form and in its content. Paolo Scarpi and others have pointed out, for example, the peculiar “incantatory” character of these verses, signaled by such devices as the repetition of words and sounds, chiasmus and the anaphora of the verb οἶδα, “I know”—a verb which when repeated elsewhere in narrative epic seems to signal very special kinds of song, for example, those of the Muses (*Theog.* 27–28) or the Sirens (*Od.* 12. 189–191).¹⁶ The “Undercutter” and “Woodcutter”, moreover, take a traditional form of Greek demon-name and most probably designate those baneful demons, who were thought to cause teething pains in the gums of infants.¹⁷

More importantly for our present inquiry, however, is the insight of Paul Maas that the shape and rhythm of l. 228 (οὐτ’ ἄρ’ ἐπηλυσίη δηλήσεται οὐθ’ Ὑποταμινόν) is nearly identical to the line cited earlier from the Cretan amulet: οὐ με καταχρίστ[ω δη]λήσεται οὐτ’ ἐπενίκτ[ω]. In both the amulet and Demeter’s speech, moreover, the issue is protection from destruction, either guarding a home from human sorcerers or a baby from incantations and demons. Are we to assume, then, that the epigraphic texts are in some way quoting or alluding to this authoritative boast of Demeter? This is extremely unlikely, since the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* is very rarely quoted in antiquity and does not seem to have acquired the authority that the Homeric and Hesiodic texts did over time.¹⁸ The 5th-cent. date of the poem and its Attic authorship create further problems, since the lead amulets are roughly contemporaneous and the Selinuntine text seems to be a copy of an even earlier 5th-cent. text.¹⁹ All of this suggests to me that protective verses of this type were already being used in the 5th century in places as

¹⁶ Richardson (1974) 229–231 and Scarpi (1976) 159–173.

¹⁷ Allen (1895) 13 in a brief note and then again in Allen, Halliday, and Sikes (1936) 155–156. See Faraone (2001) for a detailed defense of Allen’s thesis against Richardson and others. Likewise the term ἐπηλυσίη (here meaning the “attack” or “assault” presumably of a demon, sickness or spell) appears only one other time in early Greek poetry in a nearly identical construction in the Homeric *Hymn to Hermes*, where it seems to refer to the apotropaic use of tortoises at entranceways. See *Hymn to Hermes* 37. Allen, Halliday, and Sikes (1936) 282–283 give later examples of the power of the tortoise against witchcraft and illness (e.g., Pliny, *NH* 32.4) and hailstones (Africanus *ap. Geoponica* 1.14.8).

¹⁸ Richardson (1974) 67–68.

¹⁹ Jordan (1992).

widespread as Athens, Crete, Selinous and Locri, and that the composer of the Homeric *Hymn* knew this tradition and employed it in Demeter's speech to make her self-presentation as a wet nurse more plausible, since throughout antiquity wet nurses and midwives were both knowledgeable in protective magic.

Formally, then, the first two lines of Theocritus' *Id.* 11 are closest to the boasts of Demeter and those on the Cretan tablet:

Οὐδὲν ποττὸν ἔρωτα πεφύκει φάρμακον ἄλλο,
Νικία, οὐτ' ἔγχριστον, ἐμὴν δοκεῖ, οὐτ' ἐπίπαστον, κτλ.
(Theocr. *Id.* 11.1–2)

οὐ με καταχρίστ[ω δ]ηλήσεται οὐτ' ἐπενίκτ[ω]
οὔτε ποτῶ [οὔ]τ' ἐπαγωγῇ
(Phalasarna Tablet)

θρέψω, κοῦ μιν ἔολπα κακοφραδίῃσι τιθήνης
οὐτ' ἄρ' ἐπηλυσίῃ δηλήσεται οὐθ' Ὑποταμνόν
(*Hymn to Demeter*)

Theocritus, therefore, has very cleverly chosen his vocabulary for this passage and carefully composed its rhythm to recall the boast used in these traditional protective charms. His word for “ointment” (ἔγχριστον), for example, is similar to the ointment (καταχρίστ[ω]) to be ward off by the Cretan amulet, and his use of the phrase οὐτ' ἐπίπαστον at the end of the verse recalls the prefix *epi-* and the placement of οὐτ' ἐπενίκτ[ω] on the Cretan amulet, as well as the placement and closing rhythm of οὐθ' Ὑποταμνόν in the *Hymn to Demeter*. Theocritus uses the formula, of course, in a manner very different from all of these other texts. They boast that hostile ointments and potions will *do no harm* to the person who sings the hexameters or holds an amulet inscribed with them, but Theocritus seems to say that beneficial ointments or applications will *do no good*, a point to which I shall return.

2. Theocritean and Callimachean programatics

We might, then, stop here and suggest that both Theocritus and the unknown mannerist who composed the epilogue to *Id.* 9 knew and adapted a well known hexametrical charm and did so in contexts that were appropriate for a protective charm: in *Id.* 9, the echo appears in a boast about the protective value of the Muses' friendship (i.e. poetry) against the potion of a famous witch, whereas in *Id.* 11 it is in a claim about an effective poetic *pharmakon* “against *eros*”. Because both claims, moreover, are composed in hexameters in a Doric dialect and because

Id. 11 presents the Cyclops as a literary ancestor who discovered this poetic *pharmakon*, they both seem to boast Sicilian hexameters as an especially powerful form of poetry.

Suspensions about a programmatic stance in these two “Theocritean” selections deepen when we notice their close interplay with similar Callimachean moments. I have already mentioned how the boast at the end of *Id.* 9 echoes the end of the *Aitia* “Prologue”, but even more to the point are the opening lines of Callimachus’ epigram *AP* 12.150 = *HE* 1047–1050., where the poet clearly refers to this same song of Polyphemus as an “excellent incantation”:

ὦς ἀγαθὴν Πολύφαμος ἀνεύρατο τὰν ἐπαιοιδᾶν
 τῷραμένῳ· ναὶ Γᾶν, οὐκ ἀμαθὴς ὁ Κύκλωψ.
 αἱ Μοῖσαι τὸν ἔρωτα κατισχναίνοντι, Φίλιππε·
 ἧ παναγὲς πάντων φάρμακον ἡ σοφία.

How excellent an incantation Polyphemus discovered for the lover! By Earth, that Cyclops was not unlearned, for the Muses, Philip, make eros shrink. Poetry is the all-healing *pharmakon* for everything.

Because this epigram, although shifted to a homoerotic context, is composed in the same dialect as *Id.* 11 and seems to describe the same Cyclopean “discovery”, it has understandably been thought to be an imitation of or reaction to Theocritus’ poem, which was, in fact, quite famous and much imitated in antiquity.²⁰

There is, however, no ambiguity about the verbal nature of the *pharmakon* in this version, since Callimachus calls the Cyclops’ song an *epaoide*, “incantation”, and uses the word at the end of a hexameter, that is, precisely at the point where it appears in a number of hexametrical erotic charms of Hellenistic date, for example, at the end of a seven-verse love-charm: <πότνια> Κυπρογένεια τέλει τελέαν ἐπαιοιδήν, “O lady Kyprogeneia, bring to perfection this perfect incantation”.²¹ And since Aristophanes in a hexametrical fragment from a lost play uses a similar phrase at verse-end in his parody of an erotic spell (τελέει δ’ ἀγαθὴν ἐπαιοιδήν), we must imagine that these kinds of hexametrical charms were popular in the classical period as well, at least in Athens.²² From the Callimachean perspective, then, the song that Polyphemus discovers or invents was clearly a hexametrical incantation. This is obvious from

²⁰ Hunter (1999) 222–223.

²¹ *Supp.Mag.* 72, col. 1, ll. 5–14. Brashear (1979) 267 for text and Faraone (1990) 233–236 for detailed discussion.

²² Aristoph. *Amphiar.*, *PCG* 29. See Faraone (1992) 320–327, for discussion.

the way he echoes the same phrase as Aristophanes (ἀγαθὴν ἐπαιοιδίην) and places the word ἐπαιοιδίην at the end of a hexameter, where it appears in the parody and all of the bonafide spells. But he also tells us explicitly that the Cyclops' song was "for the lover" and that it was designed "to waste away" or "to shrink" *eros*, using the verb, which in poetry (e.g. Aeschylus, *Eum.* 138) refers to the power of the Erinyes to "waste away" their victims, but which medical writers use as a technical term to describe the shrinking of a tumor or a swollen joint. Thus it would seem that instead of a protective incantation Callimachus has in mind here a hexametrical incantation that attacks a tumescent disease (*eros*) and causes it to shrink or waste away. If Callimachus, however, is thinking of the Aristophanic parody²³ or the bonafide Hellenistic spells (all of which are aimed at attracting a lover), there seems to be some ambiguity here as to how the *pharmakon* helps "the lover". This ambiguity between love charm and healing charm can, however, be seen elsewhere in Greek literature (e.g. Euripides, *Hipp.* 509–516)²⁴ and it seems, in fact, to have been part of Philoxenus' treatment as well as of the Cyclops' song, for although Polyphemus apparently boasts to Galatea that he was "healing his *eros* with the Muses" (see n. 6 above), Synesius, in his summary of the poem, describes an earlier scene in which Odysseus tells the Cyclops he knows many magical "spells" (ἰσχυρεῖς) by which Polyphemus could lead Galatea to him.²⁵ Philoxenus, Callimachus and Theocritus seem to agree, therefore, in one way or another that Polyphemus "discovered" a famous song and that it was a powerful incantation, either "for the lover" or "against *eros*". This mythic Sicilian goatherd was, in short, thought to be the "first discoverer" (*protos heurētes*) of a famous hexametrical *pharmakon*, just

²³ The Hellenistic and later Roman versions (all from Egypt) of the hexametrical coda refer to the completion of a τελέαν ἐπαιοιδίην, whereas the Aristophanic parody and Callim. *AP* 12.150 both use the adjective ἀγαθὴν (cf. also Eurip. *Cycl.* 646, where the chorus refer to "an ἐπαιοιδίην ... ἀγαθὴν of Orpheus"). This may suggest that ἀγαθὴν ἐπαιοιδίην is an Attic variant—precisely that kind of *recherché* detail that Callimachus would know.

²⁴ The Nurse offers Phaedra "enchanting charms for passion" (φίλτρα ... θελκτήρια ἔρωτος), but then goes on to talk of the need for "a token (σημεῖον) of the desired man, either a lock of hair or a thread from his cloak"—all of which point to a spell designed to force Hippolytus to come unwillingly to Phaedra. When the queen, on the other hand, replies: "Is this *pharmakon* an ointment or a potion?" she seems to be thinking of something that she herself would use to treat her own lovesickness. See Faraone (1999) 7–8, for discussion.

²⁵ Synes. *Epist.* 121; see the discussion of Fantuzzi (2004) 223.

as Demeter was believed to be the first inventor of bread, Athena of the horse's bridle, and Aphrodite of the legendary ἵγξι, an erotic charm that (according to Pindar) she gave to Jason to seduce Medea.²⁶

The use of the more specific term *epaoide* in the Callimachean epigram and the high possibility that Philoxenus spoke of ἵγγιες in this same context strengthens my claim that Theocritus, although he clearly wants Nicias the physician to grasp the traditional understanding of *pharmakon* as a general kind of “cure” or “medicine” at the start of the prologue, also intends Nicias the poet (loved by all nine Muses) to recognize a second and less obvious understanding of *pharmakon* as “incantation”. This flexible use of *pharmakon* to refer to verbal utterances (both hostile and protective) as well as botanical materials (both poisons and medicines) appears, in fact, quite early in the Greek tradition²⁷ and it is associated with another famous Sicilian singer, Empedocles of Acragas, who himself boasts in hexametrical verses that he will teach protective, curative and other kinds of incantations to his protégé Pausanias (*VS* 31B111 = fr. 101 Wright):²⁸

φάρμακα δ' ὅσσα γεγάσι κακῶν καὶ γήραος ἄλλα
 πεύσῃ, ἐπεὶ μούνῳ σοι ἐγὼ κρανέω τάδε πάντα.
 παύσεις δ' ἀκαμάτων ἀνέμων μένος οἳ τ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν
 ὀρνύμενοι πνοιαῖσι καταφθινύθουσιν ἀρούρας·
 καὶ πάλιν, ἣν ἐλέλυσθα, παλίντιτα πνεύματ' ἐπάξεις·
 θήσεις δ' ἐξ ὀμβροῖο κελαινοῦ καίριον αὐχμόν
 ἀνθρώποις, θήσεις δέ καὶ ἐξ αὐχμοῖο θερείου
 ῥεύματα δενδρεόθρεπτα. †τάτ' αἰθέρι ναιήσονται,†
 ἄξεις δ' ἐξ Αἰδαο καταφθιμένου μένος ἀνδρός.

And *pharmaka*, however many are a defense against evils and old age, you will learn, since for you alone I shall accomplish all of these things. You will stop the power of the weariless winds, which along the earth rise up and lay waste to cultivated land with their blasts, and again, if you want, you will lead the winds back. And out of black rain you will set a timely drought for men, and out of a summer drought you will set tree-nourishing streams, that will pour from the sky(?). And you will lead back from Hades the strength of a dead man.²⁹

²⁶ See Graf (1997) 93 (with 265 n. 20 for bibliography), for this important insight into Pindar's description.

²⁷ See Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 165.

²⁸ Wright (1981) 10–14 discusses the conflation in Empedocles of the roles of didactic poet, doctor, sorcerer and prophet, especially in fr. 102.

²⁹ The locution μένος ἀνδρός is odd and most probably refers to bringing a ghost up

In these verses Empedocles claims knowledge of all kinds of *pharmaka*, a word that can (as we have seen) refer to both words and objects.³⁰ Scholars have usually translated the word as “herbs” or “drugs” here, because they are initially mentioned in close connection with protection against “evils and old age”, but I follow Dirk Obbink and others who translate the word as “spells” because it is natural to suppose that a master poet like Empedocles would teach hexametrical spells to Pausanias and it is very difficult to see how either of the two might have used “herbs” or “drugs” to control the winds or bring the ghost of a man up from Hades, actions which are traditionally accomplished by verbal incantations.³¹

We can partly confirm this interpretation of Empedocles’ vocation from a hostile outside source, the Hippocratic text *On the Sacred Disease*, which dates to the late 5th century BC and is a diatribe directed against people who “heal by choosing suitable words and prescribing purifications (καθαρμοί) and incantations (ἐπαιοδαί), and by advising abstinence from baths and many foods unsuitable for the sick” (1.10–12 Grensemann). A little later in the same text, we hear that these same individuals boast, as does Empedocles, that they know how to lead down the moon, cause the sun to disappear, make a storm and clear weather, cause rainstorms and droughts, and make the sea impassable and the earth infertile.³² Here, too, although ritual actions are not completely elided, the Hippocratic author clearly emphasizes verbal activity, when he speaks in the first passage about “choosing suitable words” and about “incantations”. Although there are not, to my knowledge, any explicit echoes of Empedocles in the prologue to *Id.* 11, it is clear that Theocritus imagines that his mythic countryman (“our Cyclops”) invented a song in the Sicilian tradition of protective incantation that seems to embrace both the poem inscribed on the lead amulet from

from the underworld (i.e. necromancy), not bringing someone back from the dead; see Obbink (1993) 91–92.

³⁰ For example, Wright (1981) 261 “remedies”. Obbink (1993) 91–92, on the other hand, rightly translates *pharmaka* here as “spells” and compares its use elsewhere in Empedocles.

³¹ For incantations against hailstones, see, e.g. Ohrt (1929) 1–2 (Latin *defixio* from Tragicum, which bids Gabriel to bind the hail-storm demon in “fiery chains”) and Audollent (1939). For the use of hexametrical charms in necromantic ritual, see Faraone (2005).

³² 1.29–30 Grensemann, following the translation of Collins (2001) 483. The Greek text runs: ... σελήνην τε κατὰγειν καὶ ἥλιον ἀφανίζειν καὶ χειμῶνα τε καὶ εὐδίην ποιεῖν καὶ ὄμβρους καὶ αὐχμούς καὶ θάλασσαν ἄπορον καὶ γῆν ἄφορον).

Selinus and those that Empedocles promises to teach Pausanias, which (he boasts) will provide a “defense” (ἄλκαρ) against evils and old age. Philoxenus and Callimachus, on the other hand, agree that Polyphemus’ *pharmakon* was an incantation, but both allow for a certain ambiguity between a self-healing charm and a love charm designed to force Galatea to come and make love to the Cyclops and thereby “cure” his love-sickness.

3. *Eros the disease or Eros the demon?*

When Theocritus, therefore, appears briefly in the narrative frame of *Id.* 11 as a Sicilian poet, who quotes Polyphemus’ song, he seems to boast, as Demeter or Empedocles do, about the special power of protective songs, rather than the erotic spells that Philoxenus and Callimachus seem to have in mind.³³ In both the prologue and epilogue of *Id.* 11, moreover, there are playful digs at the inferiority of medicine. This is most obvious in the final two verses of the poem, where Theocritus stops quoting the embedded song and concludes with one last observation: “in this way, you see, Polyphemus kept shepherding the *eros* by singing (ll. 80–81: ἐποίμαινεν τὸν ἔρωτα / μουσίοδων) and he was managing more easily (l. 80: ῥᾶρον δὲ διᾶγ’) than if he had paid in gold”. At this point, the poet is teasing his friend Nicias about the costly payments to doctors for medical treatment. This brief epilogue refers back, of course, to a series of propositions in the prologue: (i) poetry is the only effective *pharmakon* against *eros* (ll. 1–3); (ii) it is not easy to discover (l. 5); (iii) but the Cyclops “was managing most easily” (l. 7: ῥᾶϊστα διᾶγ’), because he discovered the *pharmakon* (l. 17). The tight ring-composition between the prologue and epilogue is clear enough, but the tense and the meaning of the two verbs used in the latter to express the Cyclops’ supposed triumph (“kept shepherding ... and was managing ...”) continue to perplex modern readers. Indeed, if we follow the usual trend in interpretation and assume that ἔρως here is a medical

³³ The verb γινώσκειν in l. 5 of the prologue to *Id.* 11 seems to be a Hellenistic variation on the use of verbs of knowing (e.g. Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* 229–230) and Euripides, *Cycl.* 646 (see n. 23) and learning (Empedocles, fr. 2.3 Wright) as boasts connected with incantations. Philodemus, for example, uses the verb twice in quick succession (*AP* 5.107.1–2 = *GPh* 3188–3189), like the doubled “I know” in Demeter’s boast, in a context that suggests the poet’s knowledge of a powerful verbal threat or charm that is nonetheless inspired by the Muses. See Fantuzzi (2004) 216–218 and 224–226.

disease, it makes little sense to say that the cure Polyphemus discovers allows him to “control” his illness.³⁴ What we expect is a much more definitive statement that the Cyclops has cured himself once and for all.

Another difficulty for the standard interpretation of *eros* as illness arises when we note the astonishingly close verbal echoes between the first few lines of *Id.* 11 and 13, both of which are addressed to Nicias:

Οὐδὲν ποττὸν ἔρωτα πεφύκει φάρμακον ἄλλο,
Νικία, οὐτ’ ἔγχριστον, **ἐμὶν δοκεῖ**, οὐτ’ ἐπίπαστον,
 ἦ ταὶ Πιερίδες· (Id. 11.1–3)

Οὐχ ἀμὴν τὸν Ἔρωτα μόνοις ἔτεχ’, **ὥς ἐδοκεῖμεν**,
Νικία, ὅτινι τοῦτο θεῶν ποικα τέκνον ἔγεντο·

It was not, as we used to think, for us alone that he begot Eros, to whichever of the gods that child was once born. (Id. 13.1–2)

The echoes here are remarkable, both in the placement of identical words and names in the hexametrical verse and the distancing editorial phrases “as it seems to me” and “as it seemed to us”. These verses both appear, moreover, at the start of a poem addressed to Nicias on the theme of erotic infatuation. For this study it matters little which of the two poems is echoing the other, although *Id.* 13 is usually thought to be the later composition.³⁵ What is of greater interest here is the fact that in the first line of *Id.* 13 the poet is clearly talking about the demonic Eros, not the disease *eros*. Do these parallels suggest, then, that Theocritus may be referring to demonic Eros in the prologue to *Id.* 11 as well? The difference between the supernatural demon and the bodily condition would not, of course, be discernible in oral performance or in the original uncial texts of *Id.* 11. Nor would it make much sense in popular thought, which often conflated demonic attack with illness.

There are, however, a few other hints that the *pharmakon* in *Id.* 11 might be used “against” a supernatural demon as well as a medical disease. At l. 16 of the prologue, for instance, Theocritus tells us that Polyphemus has a wound under his heart from “an arrow of great Cypris”, a description that plainly invokes the supernatural or demonic cause for his disease in terms (archery) usually associated with Eros.³⁶ Commentators point out, moreover, that the description of the *phar-*

³⁴ Hunter (1999) 220: “shepherded, looked after, controlled his *eros*” rather than “got rid of it”.

³⁵ See Gow (1952) vol. 2, 209.

³⁶ Aphrodite was thought by some to supply Eros with his arrows: see, for example, Eurip. *Hipp.* 31.

makon in l. 3–4 (κοῦφον δέ τι τοῦτο καὶ ἄδύ / γίνετ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώποις, εὐρεῖν δ' οὐ ῥάδιόν ἐστι) recalls the description in *Odyssey* 10 of the herb μῶλυ (thrice called a *pharmakon*: ll. 287, 292 and 303) that Hermes gives to Odysseus to protect him from danger (ll. 305–306):³⁷

... χαλεπὸν δέ τ' ὀρύσσειν
ἀνδράσι γε θνητοῖσι, θεοὶ δέ τε πάντα δύνανται.

it is difficult to dig (up) at least for mortal men, but the gods can do all things.

The danger to Odysseus is, of course, Circe, a *polypharmakos* (*Od.* 10.276), who is also to be warded off by poetry in the epilogue to the ps.-Theocritean *Id.* 9. Homer, moreover, famously attributes Circe's success to her ability to mix *pharmaka* into potions and food. Thus if we press the case for an Homeric echo here, we might say that just as Hermes provides Odysseus with an herbal *pharmakon* that will protect him from destruction (ll. 287–288: τόδε φάρμακον ... ὃ κέν τοι κρατὸς ἀλάλκησιν κακὸν ἦμαρ) at the hands of a supernatural Circe—called a “goddess” in l. 220—as long as he holds on to it, likewise (Theocritus claims) the Muses provide poets with a poetic *pharmakon* that will protect them against the supernatural demon Eros.³⁸

If we interpret the opening lines of *Id.* 11 along these lines, then, we might render them as follows: “No other *pharmakon* is there against Eros, Nicias, neither smeared on, it seems to me, nor sprinkled on, save only the Muses”. Theocritus, in other words, seems to imagine that the two types of herbal *pharmaka* (ἔγχριστον and ἐπίπαστον) that are dismissed in the prologue as inferior to the poetry (= incantation), are to be applied to one's own body to protect it, rather than carried, as Odysseus does with the herb *moly*. This protective use of magical ointment figures prominently in the third book of Apollonius' *Argonautica*,

³⁷ Hunter (1999) *ad loc.* notes this parallel and cites Kaiser for the comment that: “song, like *moly*, protects man from the dangerous female”. Presumably they mean Galatea and Circe, but Theocritus never imagines Galatea as an enemy to be protected against, only Eros.

³⁸ Hunter (1999) 220 alone seems to have seen this analogy at work in *Id.* 11, although he is keeping to the traditional interpretation that the prologue is entirely medical, not magical, in its focus: “although alleged final cures for *eros* through magical songs were a familiar aspect of ‘real life’, a familiar literary topos saw in music and song a source of ‘alleviation’ for emotional pain, and the basic sense of *pharmakon* in lines 1 and 17 is ... most likely ‘palliative’ ... Like the Homeric *moly* ... a successful song prevents contact with a destructive force (in this case *eros*) from being completely catastrophic” (his emphasis).

where Medea instructs Jason to anoint his body with a *pharmakon* and to sprinkle it on his shield and weapons in order to protect him against the spears of the earthborn men and fire-breathing bulls of her father.³⁹ The Greek magical papyri also have a number of recipes for special oils that are to be applied to the face and body in lieu of an amulet.⁴⁰ If we press the Odyssean subtext, then, Theocritus seems to boast in the prologue to *Id.* 11 that hexametrical poetry (as incantation) can protect “against (the demon) Eros” better than any other form of protective magic, much the same as Odysseus used the *moly* against Circe or as the owners of the amulets from Magna Graecia carried them to protect themselves against other female *polypharmakoi*. Verbal *pharmaka* could also be used against hostile human or anthropomorphized enemies: the disguised Demeter boasts that she knows how to keep the demonic “Undercutter” and “Woodcutter” away from Metaneira’s new baby (presumably by using the protective incantation she imitates in her speech), and the satyr chorus in Euripides’ *Cyclops* claim that they know “an excellent Orphic incantation” (see above, n. 23) that will preemptively strike the Cyclops and prevent him from harming them. And if Theocritus is, in fact, thinking of Apollonius’ Jason and the magical salve he uses to protect himself against the weapons of the earthborn men, this would further help to explain the reference (in l. 16 of *Id.* 11) to the arrows of Cypris that afflict Polyphemus.

We can also make better sense of some other sections of the narrative framing of *Id.* 11, if we understand them to refer to a demonic Eros who is to be averted or otherwise controlled by a magic spell. We can, for example, render the short epilogue to the poem as follows: “in this way, you see, Polyphemus continued to shepherd (i.e. “control” or “tame”) Eros by singing (ll. 80–81, ἐποίμαινεν τὸν ἔρωτα / μουσίοδων) and he continued to “manage” more easily (l. 80, διαῖτ’) than if he had paid in gold”. Interpreted in this way, the imperfect tenses make better sense, for just as an amulet works only when it is carried about continually like Odysseus’ *moly*, so too an incantation is effective only when it is repeated in times of danger or when it is inscribed, as in the case of the

³⁹ *Arg.* 3.1042–1049; cf. 1246–1264, where Jason follows her instructions. The *pharmakon* seems to have two-fold power: when anointed on Jason’s body it makes him more powerful, and when sprinkled on his shield and weapons it makes them invulnerable. Earlier, at 3.845–850, Apollonius tells us that this *pharmakon* was called “promethean” and that, if a man smeared it on his body after a midnight sacrifice to Hecate, “he would be wounded neither by blows of bronze, nor by burning fire”.

⁴⁰ Faraone (1999) 105–106.

lead amulets, and buried in the place to be protected. There is a similar sense of the imperfect at the end of the prologue, where Theocritus, after a long description of the Cyclops' suffering,⁴¹ tells us: "But, lo, he discovered the *pharmakon* and sitting on the high rocks and looking out to sea he kept singing in this sort of way". The embedded song of the Cyclops follows, of course, but the imperfect tense here once again suggests that its efficacy lay in its constant repetition, rather like the song of the Sirens, who also lived on an island and also sang towards the sea.

4. Conclusion

Theocritus, I suggest, composed the opening lines of *Id.* 11 in an extremely clever way to allude to both the poetic tradition of protective incantations and to the medical tradition of treating lovesickness as an actual disease. (This is probably why he identifies Nicias, his ideal audience, as knowledgeable in both areas). In doing so Theocritus cleverly plays upon the double meaning of the word *pharmakon*: he begins by saying that there exists no *pharmakon* "for *eros*" or "against *Eros*" in the form of an unguent or a salve. His words, as we have seen, can be taken in two ways: either he is thinking about herbal *pharmaka* that can be sprinkled or otherwise applied to the body of the patient and cure him of the disease of *eros*, or else he is referring, as I argued above, to the magical tradition in which unguents can be smeared on the body to protect it against the demonic *Eros*, just as Medea's *pharmakon* protects Jason against the earthborn men and fire-breathing bulls. In the first case Theocritus suggests that a kind of hexametrical poetry first invented by his fellow countryman is a better cure than any medicine a doctor can prescribe, because it will distract the patient from his woes. According to the second reading—one which requires knowledge of the Homeric *moly*, the Apollonian

⁴¹ As Gow (1952) and many commentators suggest, the participle at the end of l. 13 (ἀείδων) must be a mistake prompted by similar expressions in ll. 39 and 75. Lines 8–19 describe Polyphemus' state while he is pining after Galatea (ἤγατο in ll. 8 and 10), whereas ll. 17–18 mark a break: he invents, for the first time, the *pharmakon* and taking his seat keeps on singing it. It is, of course, possible that Theocritus means us to distinguish between two songs, one of lament and another of healing, but this distinction appears nowhere in the text. It is more economical to follow Gow in thinking that the erroneous ἀείδων has driven the original word from our texts forever.

Jason, and the Sicilian tradition of protective incantations—Theocritus claims that “*our* Cyclops” is the first to discover a special kind of protective hexametrical charm, which is more effective “against (i.e. the demonic) Eros” than the magical *pharmaka* that are traditionally smeared or sprinkled on the body (Apollonius), or those that are carried about on one’s person (Homer). This second boast may, of course, have some programmatic point to it, since Theocritus is staking claims to an indigenous Sicilian brand of hexametrical poetry, that is not epic, but rather descended from the protective incantations of Empedocles and the amulets, whose language he echoes in the second line of the prologue. He also seems to poke fun at the epic genre itself, when he describes Eros—rather than Circe or the fire-breathing bulls of Colchis—as the object of his protective incantation. Some additional proof that Theocritus intends this second level of interpretation lies in Callimachus’ apparently contentious reply to *Idyll* 11 in his own *AP* 12.150, where he also echoes the form and vocabulary of a traditional magical incantation.

PTOLEMAIC PASTORAL

SUSAN A. STEPHENS

Work on Theocritus tends to focus on his poetic antecedents, the generic ramifications of an oeuvre that includes pastoral, mime, encomium, and hymn, how or if his poems were organized into book rolls, and his literary relationship to the other Alexandrian poets. Even though Theocritus wrote poems that featured reigning monarchs, these poems are often treated as aberrations, the inevitable price of poetic employment, and distinct from the poetry that belongs to a timeless and apolitical pastoral landscape.¹ However, the recent publication of the 3rd-century papyrus roll containing 100+ epigrams attributed to Theocritus' contemporary, Posidippus of Pella,² raises questions about the validity of ignoring the clearly marked imperial poems when assessing the seemingly apolitical poems. The new roll interweaves poems about small and insignificant individuals with poems about art and artistry and poems addressed to or about the early Ptolemies in such a way that no one type can be read in isolation, and each is enriched through a reading of the others. For Posidippus poetic geography is not an embellishment: it plays a central part in the organization of the roll. There is a discernible movement in the opening section from the east—the Indian Hydaspes, the scene of Alexander's furthestmost battle—towards Ptolemaic Egypt, and throughout the roll Macedon (the home of Posidippus) is foregrounded. Finally, gender is encoded in certain explicit ways: epigrams about men tend to be separated from those about women,³ and Ptolemaic queens, particularly Arsinoe II and Berenice (I and either

¹ Even then, as Charles Segal notes, "Theocritus ... is not Virgil. His poetry remains closer to the earth, more concerned with the rhythms of nature. The poignant Virgilian tension between war and rustic ease, between threatening *urbs* and defenseless *rus* is largely absent" (Segal (1972) 1).

² The poems are translated into Italian and English in Austin & Bastianini (2002). I refer to these poems by their numbers in A.-B. For discussions of the roll as a poetry book, see Stephens (2004) and Gutzwiller's contribution in Gutzwiller (ed.) (2005).

³ This seems to be typical of epigram arrangement, so Gutzwiller (1998) 302–304, and it might also extend to Theocritus; see Gutzwiller (1996a) 141.

II or Syra),⁴ are given great prominence, the former in cult, the latter in the male venue of Panhellenic victories. There are obvious differences: Posidippus wrote epigrams, Theocritus much longer poems in a variety of genres. Theocritus wrote a number of poems on mythological subjects—Helen, Heracles, the Dioscuri—while Posidippus rarely mentions characters of myth.⁵ Most significantly, the new poems were deliberately organized into labeled sections;⁶ we do not know about the organization of Theocritus' idylls. Were the poems ordered by Theocritus or a later editor or randomly collected?⁷ Fortunately, comparison of the two poets does not depend on positing one or another order for Theocritus' poems. Richard Thomas has already demonstrated what can be gained by reading the pastoral poems against the mythological hymns and mimes.⁸ Thus it is by treating the idylls as a whole—not as a poetry book, but as a group of texts with internal dynamics and intertextual play that transcend generic boundaries—that comparison with the new papyrus can prove fruitful. Though what follows is necessarily selective, suggestive rather than exhaustive, my intent is to demonstrate how deeply the values associated with pastoral are embedded in all of Theocritus' poetry—in the hymns, the mimes, and the encomia as well as poems traditionally labeled 'bucolic'—and to rethink the relationship of *rus* and *imperium*.

Initially, in order to mitigate the constraints of generic groupings, let us consider the effect of sorting Theocritus' idylls by topic and/or geography⁹ into (i) poems mentioning or featuring members of the Ptolemaic royal house (14, 15, 17); (ii) poems on mythological subjects (13, 18, 22, 24, 26) relevant to Ptolemaic ideology.¹⁰ Two others, featuring the Cyclops (6, 11), form a bridge with (iii), poems located in Sicily or

⁴ See Thompson in Gutzwiller (2005) on the possible identifications of Berenice in the new roll.

⁵ Though he does mention Bellerophon (14.3 A.-B.), Lynceus (15.4 A.-B.), and Polyphemus (19 A.-B.).

⁶ See Gutzwiller (2004) 87–93.

⁷ I admit that I am attracted by Kathryn Gutzwiller's view ((1996a) 139–142) that the order of the poems in the 5th-cent. Antinoe papyrus reflects ordering of three separate rolls—one of pastoral poems, a second comprising *Id.* 16, [*Berenice*], *Id.* 10, 14, 13, 12, 2, 18, 24, 17, and a third consisting of 28, 29, 30, 31, 22 before it breaks off. I will return to the implications of this ordering later.

⁸ Thomas (1996) 233–238, and see below.

⁹ Gow (1952) vol. 1, xix–xxi lists the geographical references in poems not securely located.

¹⁰ The standard study is Griffiths (1979a).

South Italy. In addition to the Cyclops poems these include *Id.* 4 and 5, pastoral poems apparently located near Croton and Sybaris, and 16, the poem that devotes space to the hypothetical accomplishments of Hiero II of Syracuse. (iv) Poems that feature Cos (7, 17). (v) Miletus seems to be the location of his friend Nicias, to whom 6 and 13 are addressed, and where he travels in 28; finally, (vi) the poems with no location stated (1,¹¹ 2,¹² 3, 10, 12,¹³ 29, 30). What emerges from this schematic is how geography cuts across genres, then how central a role the Ptolemies played in Theocritus' poetry: either directly or via salient myths they account for eight of the extant twenty-two poems that are considered genuine. The non-mythological poems, if they are set in an identifiable location, fall within the southern Mediterranean between Sicily and South Italy, Alexandria, Cos and nearby Miletus. This geographic weighting is usually understood as no more than a reflection of Theocritus' origins and personal experience.¹⁴ If so it would parallel the behavior of Callimachus, whose 'real' time geographies are Cyrene (his homeland) and Alexandria, and Posidippus whose geography oscillates between Macedon (his homeland) and Egypt.¹⁵ But just as with Callimachus and Posidippus, normative geography may also have ideological underpinnings that consciously or otherwise reveal much more than pride or nostalgia. In what follows I contextualize Theocritus' invocation of myth and his illusion of place within the historical events of early 3rd century BC in order to illustrate how the pastoral landscape and its associated values functions within the corpus as a whole.

1. *Cos*

The surviving poems that make reference to Cos well illustrate the intricate matrix of the poetic, political, and pastoral that transcends generic boundaries. The island was an important cultural center in the

¹¹ Thyrsis declares himself to be "of Aitna" (l. 65), and many Sicilian locations are named, but also Chromis of Libya (l. 24) and Calydna (l. 57).

¹² See Burton (1995) 19 for the evidence for a Coan location of this idyll, and below.

¹³ Amyclae, which no doubt equals Spartan or Laconian here, and Thessalian are used as linguistic markers in *Id.* 12.13–16. For an Argive plus a Thessalian see *Id.* 14.12. For "Peloponnesian" as a linguistic marker, see *Id.* 15.92.

¹⁴ Theocritus, as narrator, claims Syracuse as his native country in *Id.* 28.16–18.

¹⁵ See Stephens in Gutzwiller (2005) for a discussion of the implications of the respective poetic geographies of Callimachus and Posidippus.

4th and 3rd-century, with civic sponsorship of Panhellenic festivals, a medical school associated with Hippocrates (established probably in the 5th century),¹⁶ and a base for the Ptolemaic fleet,¹⁷ as well as a safe retreat for members of the royal family.¹⁸ Philinus, the island's most famous athlete, who had victories in foot racing recorded in the 260s,¹⁹ is probably the figure mentioned at *Id.* 2.115.²⁰ If so, the poem could have been set on Cos, but apart from Philinus there is no further indication of place, and it does not seem poetically important to locate it there.²¹ Rather the elements of this idyll contrive to suggest the kind of thriving urban center with harbor and gymnasium and a cosmopolitan population—Delphis (a Mydian) and a Thracian nurse—that might be found throughout the Mediterranean.²² *Id.* 7, in contrast, is not only set on Cos, within it one of the island's most distinguished citizens, Philitas, is identified as a master poet, whom the younger Simichidas (= Theocritus?)²³ strove to equal (7.39–41). As scholars have noted, the poem contains many compliments and allusions to the older poet,²⁴ especially mentioning Demeter, who was the subject of Philitas' best-attested poem.²⁵ Figures in *Id.* 7 are on their way to attend a private festival of Demeter, a circumstance that attests to the agricultural prosperity of the island, namely, that some families were able to stage such an event.²⁶ For Theocritus this Coan affluence is expressed as the *locus amoenus*, a place that is both the stimulus for and the occasion of poetry (7.128–157). Philitas was obviously important as a poetic model, but his presence must also draw the poem into the imperial orbit, because he

¹⁶ See Hardie (1997) 21, Sherwin-White (1978) 256–289. For the relationship of the Coan medical school with that in Alexandria, see Sherwin-White (1978) 102–106.

¹⁷ Diod. Sic. 20.27.1–3.

¹⁸ This is a matter of inference. Ptolemy II was born there about the time Diodorus 20.27 records the extended presence of the fleet. Ptolemaic influence seems to have waned in Soter's last years, but increased in the 280s and 270s. See Fraser (1972) vol. 1, 343–346; Sherwin-White (1978) 90–108.

¹⁹ Gow (1952) vol. 2, 55 *ad l.* 115.

²⁰ A Philinus also occurs in *Id.* 7.105, which is clearly set on Cos. This Philinus is not obviously an athlete, see Burton (1995) 29 and especially 194 n. 102.

²¹ Gow (1952) vol. 1, xvii–xviii on the basis of the ethnicities (Myndian, Thracian, Assyrian) suggests an eastern Mediterranean location.

²² Burton (1995) 19.

²³ See Hunter (1999) 146–147, and Fantuzzi, this volume, pp. 252–254 for a discussion of the identification.

²⁴ Spanoudakis (2002) 40–42.

²⁵ Spanoudakis (2002) 87–92.

²⁶ Sherwin-White (1978) 228–229.

was also said to have been a tutor of Ptolemy II.²⁷ Confirmation that Philitas enjoyed imperial patronage may be found in the new Posidippus. Epigram 63 Austin-Bastianini celebrates a statue of the Coan poet dedicated through the largesse of the king himself (and presumably erected in Alexandria):²⁸ “here by order of Ptolemy both god and king the man from Cos [the statue of Philitas] has been set up for the sake of the Muses” (63.9–10). Thus “Cos” serves as shorthand for the complexities of literary patronage.²⁹ Patrons were necessary, whether city, sovereign, or the sovereign’s tutor, and praising the monarch’s tutor may have been the next best thing to praising the king himself. But the realities of patronage are muted in *Idyll* 7, transformed into or displaced by the allegorized and poetic figures that interact with the real,³⁰ just as Cos within the poem is constructed as a pastoral landscape, without reference to the ports, polis, or accoutrements of power.

In *Idyll* 17, the historical event of Ptolemy II’s birth on Cos in 308 BC³¹ is transformed into myth when the poet personifies the island as the nurse of the newborn (ll. 58–59, 64–67):

καί σε Κόως ἀτίταλλε³² βρέφος νεογυλὸν ἔοντα,
δεξαμένα παρὰ μητρὸς ὅτε πρῶταν ἶδες ἄω.
... Κόως δ’ ὀλόλυξεν ἰδοῖσα,
φᾶ δὲ καθαπτομένα βρέφους χεῖρεςσι φίλησιν·
“ὄλβιε κοῦρε γένοιο, τίους δέ με τόσσον ὅσον περ
Δῆλον ἐτίμησεν κυανάμπυκα Φοῖβος Ἰαπόλλων·

Cos cherished you as a newborn, receiving you from your mother, when you first saw daylight. ... When she saw you Cos took up the child in loving hands and exclaimed: “May you be blessed, child, and may you honor me as Phoebus Apollo honored the dark-circled Delos, etc.”

The vignette is related to if not modeled on Callimachus’ personification of Delos as the nurse of the newborn Apollo in his *Hymn to*

²⁷ According to the *Suda* (φ 332 Adler = T1 Spanoudakis), though it is not entirely clear what this would have entailed.

²⁸ Bing (2003) 331 n. 5. There seems to have been one other statue of Philitas attested, erected in Cos by the citizenry in his honor, see Spanoudakis (2002) 34–37, and Hardie (1997) 27–30.

²⁹ Griffiths (1979a) 100–101 suggests another reference to Cos in *Id.* 26 intended to link Dionysus and Ptolemy II.

³⁰ See Hunter (1999) 146–147 for the intersection of the ‘real’ and the mythical.

³¹ For Berenice and Cos, see Sherwin-White (1978) 76 n. 241 and 84.

³² The verb is used also in *Id.* 15.111 for Aphrodite cherishing Adonis. Elsewhere it means to rear or tend, often of animals, see LSJ s.v., thus an excellent linguistic bridge between the world of pastoral and that of the court.

Delos, a hymn in which Apollo prophesies the birth of Ptolemy on Cos, though which of the two is prior cannot now be ascertained.³³ Theocritus obviously praises the king by aligning his birth with that of the god, but the conceit of the island nurse might also be intended as an allusion to Philitas, given his literary significance as an educator of the young Ptolemy and the significance of Apollo as a patron of poetry. In effect, *Id.* 17 transforms patronage, or the relationship of poets and patrons, into the acknowledged subject of song. In both Callimachus and Theocritus there is a closely articulated connection between praising Ptolemy and writing poetry, and both poets vie with each other in devising imperial praise (see, e.g., ll. 135–137). But Callimachus praises Ptolemy as the conqueror of the Gauls (see below), Theocritus praises him as the bringer of ripeness, abundance, and peace (ll. 77–105). If pastoral Cos in *Id.* 7 is the space of poetry, Cos' nurturing of Ptolemy educates him for that poetic space and guarantees his worthiness as a poetic subject. Ptolemy's reign as a good king in turn guarantees the *ἀουχία* that is necessary to the existence of the pastoral world and its other inherent values.³⁴

2. *The Dioscuri*

Five of Theocritus' mythological poems feature figures who were being appropriated by the Ptolemies, either to link themselves with Alexander and the Macedonian royal house in order to bolster their own claims to legitimacy and/or divinity (Dionysus, Heracles), or to articulate Greek claims to North Africa (the legend of the Argonauts, Helen in Egypt).³⁵ Three of these poems have affinities with pastoral. The events of the

³³ See my discussion in (2003) 165–166.

³⁴ In *Id.* 28 Theocritus sails to Cos' mainland neighbor, Miletus, to visit Nicias and his wife Theugenis, presumably the same Nicias addressed in the frame of *Id.* 11 and 13. We do not know the date of *Id.* 28 but, like Cos, Miletus seems to have had ties with the Ptolemies during the early decades of Ptolemy II's reign. At nearby Didyma, for example, the Milesian demos set up a statue to Philotera, Ptolemy II's sister, who was dead and deified before the death of Arsinoe II (in 270 BC). This is not to say that Theocritus mentioned Miletus as part of a political agenda, but that his familiarity with eastern Mediterranean locations coincided with Ptolemaic sphere of influence.

³⁵ The roles of Heracles and Dionysus in Ptolemaic self-presentation have been well documented. For Heracles, see Koenen (1977) 79–86, Griffiths (1979a) 53–58, 91–98, and Stephens (2003) 123–146. For Dionysus, see Griffiths (1979a) 93–106, Rice (1983) 45–114 (on the procession of Dionysus in the Ptolemaia).

Hylas poem (*Id.* 13) are set in a *locus amoenus*; the marriage of Helen and Menelaus ends in a flowery meadow where her sacred plane tree grows (*Id.* 18.40–49), while the *Hymn to the Dioscuri* (*Id.* 22) opens with the twins' entry into a pastoral landscape.³⁶ *Id.* 13 (Heracles and Hylas) and 22 (the Dioscuri) recount events that fall at the end of Apollonius, *Arg.* 1 (Heracles and Hylas) and opening of book 2 (the boxing match between Polydeuces and Amycus). Callimachus includes the same figures, if not the events, in his *Aitia*. In Callimachus' *Aitia*, Book 1, in a reverse of Apollonius' narrative order, we first meet the Tyndaridae praying for the wellbeing of the Argo (fr. 18 Pfeiffer = 20 Massimilla), then Heracles and Theiodamas, the father of Hylas (fr. 24 Pf. = 26 M. and cf. *Arg.* 1.1213–1220).³⁷ Comparison of the three treatments (insofar as the fragments of Callimachus permit) would indicate that the pastoral elements were unique to Theocritus, and if Apollonius is prior as recent scholars tend to assume,³⁸ then we have a deliberate recasting of epic events in a pastoral mode.

To examine this further, let us consider the role of the Dioscuri in Theocritus' poems. Historically, the Dioscuri seem to belong to the earliest stratum of cult formation in Ptolemaic Alexandria, possibly because they were already being worshipped by the Greek population of pre-Ptolemaic Naucratis.³⁹ It is entirely possible that they were included with Ptolemy I and Berenice I as the *Theoi Soteres* commemorated in the lighthouse on the island of Pharos. Subsequently the Twins were co-templed with Philadelphus and later Euergetes.⁴⁰ A Dioscureion is attested in early Alexandria,⁴¹ as well as the Alexandrian deme names Kastoreios and Polydeukeios.⁴² The center of their cult, however, was Sparta.⁴³ Nearby Amyclae was said to have been their birthplace and the tomb of Aphareus was located there as well, where the fight with Lyncaeus and Idas took place. Theocritus' hymn

³⁶ Thomas (1996) 236–237.

³⁷ Barigazzi (1976).

³⁸ Sens (1997) 25–32 states the evidence for dating and priority.

³⁹ Möller (2000) 99–100.

⁴⁰ Fraser (1972) vol. 1, 207.

⁴¹ Satyrus, *On the Demes of Alexandria*, fr. 11.5 (*POxy.* 2465). See Fraser (1972) vol. 2, 122, n. 55 and 352 n. 144. In the *chora*, the Dioscuri were assimilated to the “Two Brothers”, or the crocodile gods of the Fayum. See Quaegebeur (1983) 312–316 and Von Bissing (1953) 347–357.

⁴² The deme names tend to support an early identification of the Dioscuri with the *Theoi Soteres*—Ptolemy I and Berenice I.

⁴³ Burkert (1985) 212–213.

serves to bind Egypt and Sparta, who were close allies during the period before and during the Chremonidean war,⁴⁴ by stressing their commonality of worship. It does so by celebrating the Dioscuri in two separate myths—that of the Argonauts, which is a founding myth of Greek colonies in North Africa,⁴⁵ and the stealing of the Leucippidae, which is an important myth in Spartan cult, probably associated with ephebic rituals.⁴⁶ In addition, the devotion of the brothers to each other within the hymn can be read as a tale of mutual military support. But the Dioscuri were equally attached to Sicily and South Italy via their Spartan origins. They had cult centers at Tarentum and Locri, and a local legend had them coming from Sparta to the aid of the Locrians against Croton.⁴⁷ Thus for Theocritus the Dioscuri do double duty in providing a bridge between the Ptolemaic royal house and Sparta on the one hand and with western Greece on the other, as we see in *Id.* 16. A central feature of their worship was the *theoxenia*—celebrated as a banquet at which two empty places were left. The ritual is one of guest friendship, and in exchange for this act of hospitality the Dioscuri were subsequently obliged to come to the aid of their hosts.⁴⁸ The *theoxenia* surely underlies the opening of *Id.* 22, in which Amycus violates the rules of guest friendship with his churlish refusal of gift exchange or even water to drink (but see below). It also is relevant to the role of the Dioscuri in *Id.* 16, where Theocritus elaborates an argument that wealth without a poet to celebrate it goes for naught. As counter examples he lists a number of Thesalian dynasts, all probably related to the Scopadae, to whom immortal fame accrued thanks to the poems of Simonides (ll. 34–39). Theocritus only briefly mentions the Scopadae and Simonides, but Callimachus presents a fuller version of their dealings in the *Aetia*. The story goes that Simonides inserted a myth praising the Dioscuri by way of *exemplum* into a poem commissioned by Scopas, who then refused to

⁴⁴ See Fantuzzi's discussion in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 379–383 and 395–399 for Sparta and early Alexandrian poetry.

⁴⁵ See Stephens (2003) 173–183.

⁴⁶ Burkert (1985) 212. See Sens (1997) 159 n. 22 for the Amyclaeon throne.

⁴⁷ The date for this battle around the river Sagra is disputed, though all versions insist that the appearance of the Dioscuri on the side of the Crotoniates turned the battle (Diod. Sic. 8.32, Cic. *Nat. D.* 3.5, Strabo 261, Justin 20.3).

⁴⁸ Redfield (2003) 251–252 points out that, according to Diodorus, the aid of the Dioscuri to the Locri was specifically set up to be a *theoxenia*: the Locrian ambassadors “prepared a couch for the Dioscuri on their ship and sailed back to their country” (*Id.* 8.32).

pay him the full price, telling Simonides to collect the rest from the Twins, since he had sung their praises as well.⁴⁹ Subsequently, during a banquet hosted by the Scopadae, Simonides was called out of the banquet hall, on the grounds that two young men wished to speak with him. When he was outside, the chamber was entirely destroyed by an earthquake, the Scopadae and their fellow banqueters killed.⁵⁰ The Dioscuri thus repaid their debt in saving Simonides' life. Theocritus' advice to Hiero II at ll. 26–29 sets out the moral of the allusion proleptically:

... αἶεϊ δὲ θεοῖς ἐπιβόμια ῥέζειν,
μηδὲ ξεινοδόκον κακὸν ἔμμεναι ἀλλὰ τραπέζῃ
μειλίξαντ' ἀποπέμψαι ἐπὶν ἐθέλωντι νέεσθαι,
Μοισάων δὲ μάλιστα τίειν ἱεροὺς ὑποφήτας.

make sacrifice to the gods, and do not be a bad host but after treating the stranger kindly at one's table send him off where he wishes to go, and especially honor the holy interpreters of the Muses.

Theocritus' not quite told tale of Simonides, Scopas, and the Dioscuri leaves under erasure the power of poets to effect immortality of a different sort—inscribing in memory the fate of those who failed as hosts in honoring “the holy interpreters of the Muses.”

3. Id. 4 and 5

The mythological figures of the Dioscuri (and Heracles) so favored by the Ptolemies are also found in the South Italian landscape of *Id.* 4, where they may not be as benign. This poem is counted among the pastorals and has been subject to a variety of interpretations.⁵¹ The main characters Battus and Corydon engage not in a singing contest, typically found in Theocritean pastoral, but in an exchange of information about local affairs. Battus begins by noting the poor condition of the herd, abandoned by its master Aegon, who has gone off in pursuit of an Olympic victory in boxing. Corydon's responses express unhappiness with the circumstances and frustration, but then a recovered optimism. The theme of abandonment or loss aligns Aegon

⁴⁹ *PMG* 510. Cicero tells this part of the story (*De or.* 2.86, 2.157) and a later version is to be found in Quint. *Inst.* 11.2.11–16.

⁵⁰ Callim. *Aetia*, fr. 64.11–14 PF.

⁵¹ See Segal (1986) 176–212 and Gutzwiller (1991) 147–157.

with Daphnis in *Id.* 1, a figure who belongs to the timeless realm of the bucolic,⁵² and whose dying provokes the idealized landscape to the usual pathetic fallacy. In contrast, Aegon's trainer is Milon, a name that conjures up the famous Crotoniate boxer of the 6th century. Thus the historical past is superimposed on a timeless and ahistorical *locus amoenus* that is further disrupted by the introduction of mythic heroes (*Id.* 4. 8–9):

KO. φαντί νιν Ἡρακλῆι βίην καὶ κάρτος ἐρίσδειν.

BA. κῆμ' ἔφαθ' ἅ μάτηρ Πολυδεύκεος ἦμεν ἀμείνω.

(Corydon) They say he [Aegon] rivals Heracles in strength and might.
(Battus) Yes, and I, so my mother says, am better than Polydeuces.

Heracles and Polydeuces are predictable frames of reference for Aegon, a boxer with Olympic pretensions, but they carry a certain amount of intertextual baggage.⁵³ Battus' deliberately ludicrous comparison of himself with Polydeuces underscores the distance between the world of *Id.* 4 and heroic myth at the same time that it invokes a figure from the heroic world with local associations—the Dioscuri at the battle of Sagra mentioned above. Further, Battus' Polydeuces seems intertextually related to the opening exchange between Polydeuces and Amycus at *Id.* 22.54–74.⁵⁴ The crossover between the two poems suggests that the Dioscuri are intrusive and potentially threatening to the pastoral world that is so carefully detailed at 22.35–43. The abuse of guests and hostile exchanges are resolved by sex and song in the *locus amoenus*, but in the heroic world that Amycus and the Dioscuri inhabit they lead to more dangerous behaviors. Heracles, of course, is always violent, and his dealings in South Italy are no exception. Diodorus relates how Heracles when he was stealing the Cattle of the Sun accidentally killed Croton, but gave him a magnificent funeral and prophesied that he would give his name to a great city.⁵⁵ A little later in the poem Battus steps on a thorn, an event reminiscent of Callimachus' *Aetia*, fr. 24 Pf.

⁵² Hunter (1999) 131.

⁵³ The lines seem to recall an epinician of Simonides for another boxer, Glaucus of Carystus (*PMG* 509 = Lucian, *Imag.* 19): "not even would the might of Polydeuces raise his hands against him nor the iron son of Alcmena".

⁵⁴ See Thomas (1996) 233–237, who points out that the stichomythia in *Id.* 22.54–74 is unique to the hymns, but has close formal parallels with the stichomythia of *Id.* 4.1–14. *Prima facie* *Id.* 4 should then precede *Id.* 22.

⁵⁵ 4.24.7. The city was founded by Myscellus near Croton's tomb. See Ovid, *Met.* 15.1–81, and Pfeiffer (1949/53) vol. 2, 114 n. 85.3 (addenda), where the name of Myscellus is a conjecture in a fragment on Euthycles of Locri (fr. 84–85 Pf.).

= 26 M., in which Heracles steps on a thorn as he encounters Theiodamas. Heracles also kills Theiodamas. Battus' misstep precipitates an exchange about the dangers of straying unprepared into the pastoral landscape, an exchange that resonates for more than the speaking rustics. It may also apply to the intrusion of the heroic into the pastoral landscape—for Heracles in *Id.* 13 and the Dioscuri in *Id.* 22, the *locus amoenus* proves confusing, inhospitable, and dangerous. It is there that the heroic Heracles is proved incapable of dealing with the erotic when he loses Hylas to the indigenous nymphs and the Dioscuri meet a figure whose demands for solitude and refusal to engage in the usual heroic courtesies can only be resolved by violence.

If the mythological figures are disquieting when taken in connection with the poem's location, that disquiet is intensified when we consider the historical situation in Croton at the approximate time of Theocritus' writing.⁵⁶ Gow in fact expresses astonishment at the poem's location: "... it is certainly remarkable that in the first half of the third century T[heocritus] should select Croton as ... the nominal scene of tranquil pastoral life",⁵⁷ because the recent Pyrrhic wars had left the region ravaged and depopulated. We cannot dismiss Gow's concerns by assuming an audience was meant to think only of the glory days of archaic Croton. "Croton" would inevitably have called to mind present circumstances as well as the past. By naming a city that had seen warfare for a generation the poet must be intentionally destroying the fabric of pastoral time and inserting a level ostensibly missing from most of the other pastoral poems—the real historical experience of the early 3rd century.

The 'real' world may be glimpsed in other references as well. Corydon, we are told, has inherited Aegon's *syrix* (*Id.* 4.29–32):

KO. ... ἐπεὶ ποτὶ Πῖσαν ἀφέρπων
δῶρον ἐμοί νιν ἔλειπεν· ἐγὼ δέ τις εἰμὶ μελικτᾶς,
καὶ μὲν τὰ Γλαύκας ἀγκροῦμαι, εὖ δὲ τὰ Πύρρον.
αἰνέω τάν τε Κρότωνα—"Καλὰ πόλις ἄτε Ζάκυνθος ...".

(Corydon) ... as he [Aegon] was going to Pisa he gave me it [the *syrix*] as a gift. I have a certain gift for it and can on the one hand easily strike up the airs of Glaucus and on the other τὰ Πύρρον. I praise Croton—"Zacynthos is a fair city ...".

⁵⁶ Barigazzi (1974) 306–307, 310–311 and Segal (1986) 210.

⁵⁷ Gow (1952) vol. 2, 77.

Glauca, we learn from other sources, was a citharode, and incidentally a mistress of Ptolemy II.⁵⁸ Corydon also strikes up τὰ Πύρρων.⁵⁹ There are a number of possible identifications for Pyrrhus as a musician or songwriter,⁶⁰ but if Glauca opens the poem up to the contemporary world of Alexandria, “Pyrrhus”, followed immediately by Croton, surely would remind a contemporary audience of the Italian wars.⁶¹ The Epirote warlord was a sometime brother-in-law to Ptolemy, having married Soter’s stepdaughter, Antigone. One of his sons was even called Ptolemy.⁶² During the late 270s Arsinoe II was probably abetting him in his war against Macedon. So the names would scarcely be unfamiliar in an Alexandrian setting. The name of Battus has contemporary ramifications as well. Battus was the historical founder of Cyrene, from which his descendants were called the Battiadae.⁶³ Callimachus claims connection to this royal house, describing himself as *Battiades*.⁶⁴ Other elements indicate that the presence of “Callimachus” in *Id.* 4 is not wholly far-fetched. Callimachus certainly wrote about Sicilian cities in the second book of his *Aetia*, and also about South Italian cities and/or athletes (though the location of some of the fragments is unknown). His line: “well-crowned Croton” survives (fr. 616 Pf.), as well as a line about Milon (fr. 758 Pf., though of doubtful attribution), and an *aition* featuring the boxer Euthycles of Locri (*Aetia*, fr. 84–85 Pf.). Additionally there are at least three potential allusions to Callimachus in this 63-line poem—a very high density to assign to chance. In l. 15 we find the comparison to a cicada living on dew (compare *Aetia*, fr. 1.32–34 Pf. = M.), in ll. 35–36 Aegon dragging down a bull from the hills and bestowing it at the feet of his appalled girl friend resembles the actions of Theseus in the *Hecale*,⁶⁵ and in ll. 45–51 one telling verbal reminiscence (Λέπαργος

⁵⁸ Hunter (1999) 136–137 n. 31. Naming her has been construed as a subtle compliment to Ptolemy (see the discussion of Cynisca below).

⁵⁹ “It has sometimes been supposed that τὰ Πύρρων means *the exploits of Pyrrhus*, ... but that is plainly impossible”: Gow (1952) vol. 2, 83–84.

⁶⁰ Hunter (1999) 136–137 n. 31.

⁶¹ Especially since Pyrrhus’ chief aid at Tarentum was Milon. So Gow ((1952) vol. 2, 77), who finds it a “curious coincidence”.

⁶² Plutarch, *Vita Pyrr.* 26.2.

⁶³ See Herodotus 4.150–159 on Battus and the foundation of the Cyrenean royal house.

⁶⁴ *AP* 7.415.1 = *HE* 1185; see also *AP* 7.525 = *HE* 1179ff.

⁶⁵ Fr. 260 Pf. = 69 Hollis, and see Hunter (1999) 137–138 nn. 34, 35–37, who provides a number of equally compelling anecdotes connected to Milon.

as an animal's name⁶⁶) and an incident similar to fr. 24–25 Pf. = 26–27 M., Heracles' encounter with a thorn and Theiodamas, discussed above.⁶⁷ I do not want to suggest that Battus and Corydon are pastoral masks for Callimachus and Theocritus, but rather that *Id.* 4 stages differing poetic responses to the contemporary world, not as a singing contest—indeed it cannot because the registers of heroic myth, ancient glory, and the timeless and apolitical *pleasance* are competing and discontinuous. These dissonances, in tandem with recent events that must have threatened the stability of rural economies, preclude meaningful song.

Id. 5 is also located in South Italy, in the vicinity of Sybaris and Thurii. What emerges at the opening of this poem is the utter poverty of the speakers. These characters lay claim to the lowest status of any in the idylls—a slave (whether real or merely an insult) and a freedman who lords it over him, but who in turn answers to a master (ll. 1–10):

KO. Αἶγες ἐμαί, τήνον τὸν ποιμένα, τὸν Συβαρίταν,
φεύγετε, τὸν Λάκωνα· τό μεν νάκος ἐχθὲς ἔκλειπεν.
ΛΑ. οὐκ ἀπὸ τᾶς κρᾶνας; σίττ', ἀμνίδες· οὐκ ἐσορήτε
τόν μεν τὰν σύριγγα πρόαν κλέψαντα Κομάταν;
ΚΟ. τὰν ποίαν σύριγγα; τὸ γάρ ποκα, δῶλε Σιβύρτα,
ἐκτάσω σύριγγα; τί δ' οὐκέτι σὺν Κορύδωνι
ἀρκεῖ τοι καλάμας αὐλὸν ποπτύσδεν ἔχοντι;
ΛΑ. τάν μοι ἔδωκε Λύκων, ὠλεῦθερε. τὴν δὲ τὸ ποῖον
Λάκων ἀγκλέψας ποκ' ἔβα νάκος; εἰπέ, Κομάτα·
οὐδὲ γάρ Εὐμάρα τῷ δεσπότη ἦς τοι ἐνεύδειν.

(Comatas) Goats, stay away from that shepherd, the Sybarite, Lacon. He stole my goatskin yesterday. (Lacon) Get back from the spring—hey, lambs, don't you see that Comatas who stole my *syrinx* yesterday? (Co.) What *syrinx*? How have you, slave of Sibyrta, come by a *syrinx*? Why doesn't playing the reed pipe with Corydon still please you? (La.) The one Lycon gave me, Freedman. But what skin did Lacon make off with? Tell me, Comatas. Since not even your master, Eumaras, has one to sleep in.

Unlike Croton, which still existed in Theocritus' lifetime, Sybaris had been destroyed in 510 BC and by Croton. Some of its inhabitants later joined with Athenians to found Thurii, which fared ill in the 4th and early 3rd century, when it was sacked by Tarentum (in 282 BC). Apparently the Sybarites were later expelled from Thurii and established a

⁶⁶ Fr. 24.19 Pf. = 26.19 M. The restoration is guaranteed by the scholium.

⁶⁷ Barigazzi (1976) 237–238.

new community with the old name nearby, though it was poor and undistinguished if it existed at all by Theocritus' day.⁶⁸ Yet Theocritus goes to some pains to establish his characters as "Sybarite" and "Thurian". Why? First, the idyll depends on the contrast between the opening exchange of insults and the subsequent amoebean song contest. The initial poverty of the speakers is juxtaposed to the abiding richness of the pastoral landscape projected in their song, and measured in soft fleeces, milk, honey, apples, and bees. No doubt both the abject poverty and the pastoral abundance should be understood as poetic exaggerations, but they are thrown into sharp relief against the backdrop of Sybaris, where the decadence of its inhabitants made the city a by-word for hubristic excess. Athenaeus, for example, provides a number of anecdotes that demonstrate the Sybarites' use of wealth without good sense or restraint, particularly with respect to clothing. The Sybarites wore only Milesian wool (519b); their cavalrymen wore saffron cloaks over their armor (519c); they had a law requiring calls to public sacrifice be issued a year in advance to allow women time to prepare their garments (521c); one Sybarite had a magnificent robe made and placed on exhibit during a festival of Hera, which Dionysius I subsequently sold for 120 talents (541a-b). Theocritus' rustic exchange about a "Sybarite slave" who needs to steal an animal skin for a cloak highlights the drastic change in the Sybarites' fortunes. Thus the idyll calls attention to the reduced circumstances of this region of Magna Graecia, and to the seemingly enduring values that Theocritus invests in the rural landscape and its fruitfulness.

4. *The Cyclops poems*

Just as it is impossible for a poem set near Croton or Sybaris to escape its residue of contemporary referentiality, so too Polyphemus and Galatea (*Id.* 6 and 11) cannot have been an entirely innocent topic in the early 3rd century. Already in Homer the Cyclops infects the pastoral landscape with brutishness and insolence. Subsequent comedy and satyr play established Polyphemus as uncivilized and hedonistic, and aligned him with the bestial components of human nature,

⁶⁸ Strabo 263 and see Dover (1961) 127-128.

stressing his conspicuous consumption and lack of self-awareness.⁶⁹ By the 3rd century the figure has taken on a political dimension as well. The Macedonian historian Marsyas recorded that just before Philip II of Macedon had lost his eye in battle entries in a local dithyrambic production (Marsyas lists three) had as their subject the Cyclops.⁷⁰ Thus poetry 'predicted' Philip's loss, and by recording the anecdote Marsyas guaranteed its survival in the biographical tradition. Philip was not the only Macedonian king to be a Cyclops. Plutarch records that Antigonus, so-called Monophthalmos, put the Chian philosopher Theocritus to death for referring to him behind his back as "Cyclops".⁷¹ Philoxenus' dithyramb, written in the early 4th century, was later taken as a satire on the tyrannical behavior of Dionysius I of Sicily, and the *Galatea* of the comic poet Alexis, from Thurii, may have been in the same mode.⁷² Philoxenus, so the allegory goes, had fallen in love with the king's mistress, named Galatea. He was punished for his temerity by being sent to the stone quarry, where he retaliated by later writing a dithyramb on the incident casting Dionysius in the role of the Cyclops, Galatea as the sea nymph, and himself as Odysseus.⁷³ Apparently Philoxenus' dithyramb was the first to make Polyphemus the lover of Galatea.⁷⁴ Theocritus makes Polyphemus his countryman in *Id.* 11.7 and elsewhere in the poem he echoes Philoxenus.⁷⁵ The erotic encounter of the Sicilian (or Syracusan?) Polyphemus takes on a further ominous aspect in historical writers: Polyphemus and Galatea produced three sons, Galates, Illyrius, and Celtes, that is, the eponymous ancestors of the Galati (Gauls), Illyrians, and Celts.⁷⁶ During the 4th and early 3rd-century Gaulish tribes moved east through northern Europe as far as Turkey, where they eventually settled (Galatia). In the decades of their migrations they intermittently raided and plundered unguarded

⁶⁹ Gutzwiller (1991) 64–65. Her argument (p. 62) that the Cyclops might have been an unskilled singer in Philoxenus is very attractive.

⁷⁰ Didymus on Demosthenes, col. 12.57–62 Pearson-Stephens = *PMG* 840.

⁷¹ Plutarch, *De liberis educ.* 11a–b.

⁷² Gutzwiller (1991) 64–65.

⁷³ Athenaeus 6b–7a = *PMG* 816. The poem must have been written before 388 BC, when Aristophanes parodies it in the *Plutus*.

⁷⁴ *PMG* 819–820. Σ Aristoph. *Plutus* (where Philoxenus is parodied) informs us that Philoxenus introduced the Cyclops as the lover of Galatea because this was a veiled reference to Dionysius, who had weak eyesight.

⁷⁵ See (Hardie) 1997, 30–32 for echoes of Philoxenus in early Hellenistic poetry.

⁷⁶ Recorded in Appian, *Illyr.* 2. Timaeus also records this information, *FGHist* 566F69, 72.

settlements, attracted the disaffected in the regions they passed through, and generally undermined local authority. When they finally settled (in Galatia), they became a ready source of mercenaries for the various kingdoms of the Successors. In 279 BC the Gaulish leader Brennus even attacked Delphi—an event probably of greater symbolic than political or military importance—, and Callimachus makes good use of it (*Hymn* 4.171–185). A few years later (ca. 275 BC) Ptolemy II was forced to suppress an insurrection among the Gaulish mercenaries he had employed during the first Syrian war.

Commemorating victories against the Gauls became a growth industry in the early 3rd century. Callimachus memorializes the victory in his *Hymn to Delos*, when the unborn Apollo prophesies from his mother's womb that a "Ptolemy to be" (ἔσσομένε Πτολεμαῖε) would annihilate these "latter day Titans" (ὀψίγονοι Τιτῆνες, 4.174). Papyrus fragments of two other poems on the subject more or less contemporary with the Delos hymn have survived. Scholars are divided about the kings for whom they are written—Antigonos Gonatas, Antiochos I, and Attalus I have all been proposed, which at the very least provides an indication of the extent of military activity directed against the invaders.⁷⁷ In addition to the Delos hymn, Callimachus is credited with a *Galatea*, one of the fragments attributed to which is clearly about Brennus and his sack of Delphi.⁷⁸ Aratus' *Hymn to Pan* has been claimed as a topical reference to Antigonos' defeat of the Gauls in 277.⁷⁹ Against this background the erotic encounter of Polyphemus and Galatea would have carried an implicit subtext of imperial short-sightedness on the one hand (a legacy of the comic and satiric tradition), and of the destruction wrought by their offspring on the other (a legacy of the historical and contemporary poetic tradition), just as adventures of Polyphemus set before his encounter with Odysseus must leave the reader with a presentiment of his impending blindness.⁸⁰ It is also important to note that Polyphemus as a good herdsman in *Id.* 11.34–37 in some respects resembles the good king Ptolemy of *Id.* 17:

⁷⁷ *SH* 958 and 969. See the judicious discussion in Barbantani (2002) 63–134.

⁷⁸ Athenaeus 284c. See *fr.* 378–379 Pf.

⁷⁹ No fragments of the hymn survive, so it is impossible to be sure what it celebrated, though it has been claimed as a marriage hymn for Antigonos and Phila in 276 BC as well as a victory hymn. See *SH* 115 for the testimonia, and Barbantani (2002) 122–124. The Aratus named in Theocritus' *Id.* 7 has been identified as Aratus of Soli, and the reference to Pan taken as an allusion to his poem (Gow (1952) vol. 2, 118) though the evidence is not persuasive.

⁸⁰ See Griffiths (1979a) 12 n. 13 and Gutzwiller (1991) 63–64.

ἀλλ' οὗτος τοιοῦτος ἐὼν βοτὰ χίλια βόσκω,
 κῆκ' τούτων τὸ κρᾶτιστον ἀμελγόμενος γάλα πίνω·
 τυρὸς δ' οὐ λείπει μ' οὔτ' ἐν θέρει οὔτ' ἐν ὀπώρα,
 οὐ χειμῶνος ἄκρω· ταρσοὶ δ' ὑπεραχθέες αἰεὶ.

such as I am I tend a thousand cattle, and I drink the milk taken from the best of them. Neither in summer nor autumn, nor in deepest winter do I lack cheese. My racks are ever heavily burdened.

He possesses numerous flocks and husbands them well. But underneath this description lies the gargantuan appetite of the *Odyssey*, where milk and cheese alone are not sufficient. Also, the rare compound of ὑπερ + ἀχθέες hints at the excess—a common attribute of tyrants—and we note the thousand head of cattle serving the appetites of one man alone. Theocritus' Polyphemus is amusing and affecting but not harmless. By the 3rd century he was a creature who had entered the political iconography, both as a tyrant in the rough and for the dangers implicit in his love of Galatea, namely, successful *eros* with its destructive offspring.⁸¹

5. *Id.* 14 and 15

If *Id.* 4 and 5 set their *locus amoenus* in South Italy's troubled agricultural regions, *Id.* 14 and 15 focus on the mobile and ethnically diverse populations of Hellenistic towns and cities. Both poems are mimes in the Syracusan tradition of Epicharmus and Sophron. As Frederick Griffiths points out, *Id.* 14 and 15 seem to form a pair, perhaps in imitation of Sophron's gender specific mimes for men and for women, and can be read as reciprocals of each other.⁸² Both also have affinities with

⁸¹ Posidippus compresses similar elements into an epigram (19 Austin-Bastianini) that entreats Poseidon to stay his hand and not hurl a massive boulder on to the shore: the boulder, we are told, "is more ill-omened than the door stone (θυρεός) of Polyphemus. Polyphemus could not have lifted it, he the lovesick goatherd, who swims close by Galatea" (19.6–8 A.-B). Posidippus' Polyphemus is domesticated and eroticized, but he is also the casual cannibal of the *Odyssey*—the door stone tells us this. And "swimming close" to Galatea may hint at a fruitful erotic encounter—the outcome of which was even more ill-omened than the cannibalism of the *Odyssey*. (I am indebted to Marco Fantuzzi for this final observation). Livrea (2004) also connects the epigram to the tradition of Polyphemus and Galatea as ancestors of the Gauls (43), making the attractive suggestion that θυρεός refers to Gallic shields (44).

⁸² Griffiths (1979a) 109. I am heavily indebted in this section to Griffiths (1979a) 107–128 and Burton (1995) 7–40.

the pastoral poems. Like the pastorals, *Id.* 14 begins with an encounter between Aeschinias and Thyonichus that leads not to a singing contest or song, but to a narrative of private woes (ll. 12–56). No location for the encounter of the two men is given but Aeschinias mentions three men in his flashback to an earlier party held in the country in which his suspicions of his girl friend's faithlessness led him to hit her, and her to seek comfort elsewhere. Now two months later the aging and lovelorn Aeschinias is thinking of going abroad as a cure for his malady. He cites the example of Simus, a man of his own age, "who was enamored of that brazen woman, went abroad and returned cured" (ll. 53–54). Thyonichus, who seems well informed on the subject, urges him to become a mercenary in Ptolemy's army. Joan Burton comments on the social dynamics:

Idyll 14's symposium reflects an expanded and mobile world in the geographic diversity and occupational mobility of its male guests ... The symposium's placement in an unspecified countryside (14) further underscores the guests' status as men set loose in the world. Insofar as symposia and gymnasia traditionally reinforced Greek male solidarity and fellowship, dislocated Greek males could try to restore their sense of self-identity and community by participating in such institutions. But *Idyll* 14's symposium, rather than affirming its host's sense of self and community, leaves Aeschinias feeling isolated and depressed.⁸³

Gymnasia and symposia are associated with town life, but Theocritus sets Aeschinias' drinking party in a rural setting (l. 14: ἐν χώρῳ παρ' ἐμὸν, "at my place in the country"). The song (l. 30), the lover's quarrel (ll. 20–35), the similes of apples (l. 38), of the swallow (ll. 39–40), of the bull running off to the wood (l. 44), and the animal names for the lovers (Wolf and Little Bitch) draw the country symposium firmly into the orbit of pastoral.⁸⁴

Yet his companions are not herdsmen: when occupations are given, we meet a soldier and a ἵπποδιώκτας, "driver of steeds" (see below p. 110), and from two regions—Argos, Thessaly—that had considerable experience with mercenary armies.⁸⁵ The events in the poem reflect the status quo in the early 3rd century, where work as a mercenary soldier was one of the few means for advancement, and every Hellenistic

⁸³ Burton (1995) 25.

⁸⁴ See Pretagostini, this volume, pp. 67–73.

⁸⁵ For a generation Thessaly was embroiled in war between Pyrrhus and Macedon. Pyrrhus had invaded Argos in 272 BC, where he died (Plutarch, *Vita Pyrr.* 34).

king was in constant need of a fresh supply of able men. *Id.* 14 comes close to Virgil in that it allows a glimpse of the social realities of the country. Property owners were likely to be townsmen, not herdsman, and mercenary employment was the quickest means of advancement for a poor man. It also reflects the fact that, in the wake of Alexander's conquests, the free *poleis* with their citizen soldiers were being absorbed into centrally administered empires. Ethnicity (as we see in *Id.* 15) was more a matter of accent than of political identity. But Aeschinas, with his country place, is in no immediate need of economic advancement, which makes Thyonichus' remark that "Ptolemy is the best paymaster for a free man" (l. 59) worth considering more closely. It is followed by a description of Ptolemy—*εὐγνώμων, φιλόμουσος, ἐρωτικός, εἰς ἄκρον ἀδύς*, "kindly, fond of arts, gallant, as pleasant as may be"—that mentions his generalship not at all (l. 62). But good generals, like Pyrrhus or Hiero II, often got their soldiers killed. For a man enlisting to get over a love affair, a good paymaster might well be the one who least exchanged men's bodies for burial urns. Thyonichus' description is not, as most commentators assume, a characterization of the king as a playboy.⁸⁶ Ptolemy's good judgment is not in question; he can clearly distinguish his friends from his enemies (l. 63). Thyonichus' snapshot is of a king focused on peace rather than war, and who is a good fit for a poet as well (*φιλόμουσος, ἐρωτικός*). In fact, one of the incentives Ptolemy II used to attract soldiers was land—allotments in proportion to rank—that enabled men not only to immigrate but also to settle when their enlistment period was completed. Ptolemy II's land reclamation project in the Fayum, about fifty miles west of Memphis, in many ways resembles the idealized countryside of Theocritus' poems. Although Aeschinas already owns land and Simus, the figure he invokes by way of example, seems to have served as a mercenary and returned to his place of origin, far more of those who served the Ptolemies became permanent immigrants, like the figures who inhabit *Id.* 15.

There may be a further Ptolemaic dimension to *Id.* 14. Aeschinas' girlfriend is given the name Cynisca (l. 31), that is, "Little Bitch," which is usually taken to be ironic. There was another Cynisca, however, the daughter of the Spartan king Archidamus II, who bred horses and who had won chariot victories at Olympia (396, 392 BC).⁸⁷ Her Olympic

⁸⁶ E.g. Griffiths (1979a) 111.

⁸⁷ Pausanias 3.8.1.

monument celebrated her as the first woman winning glory throughout Greece for her victory.⁸⁸ We now find that Posidippus wrote a series of epigrams commemorating Ptolemaic victories in chariot racing at the Panhellenic games. One of these describes Berenice I's victory at Olympia as appropriating the *kydos* of Spartan Cynisca. Her horses exclaim (87 Austin-Bastianini):

... Ὀλυμ[πια]χὸν Βερενίκας
 ... ἀγάγοι[ε]ς στέφανον
 ὃς τὸ [πο]λυθρόλατον ἔχει κλέος, ᾧ τὸ Κυνίσκας
 ἐν Σπάρ[η]τᾳ χρόνιον κῦδος ἀφειλόμεθα.

... we won Berenice's Olympic crown, which has a much vaunted reputation, with it we eclipsed the ancient *kydos* of Cynisca in Sparta.

Aeschinas' rural drinking party included Cynisca, a Thessalian ἵπποδιώκτας, Agis, and a soldier named Cleunicos, a group for whom we can find a remarkable confluence. Spartan Cynisca had a brother named Agis, and the constituent parts of the soldier's name are κλέος and νίκη. In this context the troublesome compound ἵπποδιώκτας makes sense: Hesychius glosses it ἡνίοχος, that is, chariot driver.⁸⁹ Given the prominence of Cynisca's monument and the importance of chariot racing especially among the early Ptolemaic queens, it is not difficult to imagine that these names and the situation—Cynisca beaten and abandoning the field, her old love setting out for Ptolemy—were deliberately contrived as a sly allusion to what must have been publicly commemorated events: Ptolemy's womenfolk winning Olympic victories. However, Cynisca's ambiguous social status in the poem when taken with the epithet ἐρωτικός applied to Ptolemy, points perhaps not to Berenice I, Ptolemy II's mother and the first Ptolemaic queen to win a victory, but in another direction. I am inclined to think that Theocritus was alluding to Ptolemy II's mistress, Bilistiche, who also won Olympic victories in 268 and 264. This kind of joke would suit the male milieu of the idyll and the symposium atmosphere it celebrates, in which mistresses might be toasted for their accomplishments.⁹⁰

⁸⁸ *AP* 13.16. See Fantuzzi's helpful discussion of the Cynisca victory dedication and the Posidippus epigrams (Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 648–655).

⁸⁹ See Gow's discussion (1952) vol. 2, 250 n. 12.

⁹⁰ This would tend to confirm Cameron (1995) 241–246, who argues that *AP* 5.202 = *HE* 974ff., the “horsewomen” epigram, attributed to either Asclepiades or Posidippus, was commemorating a victory of Bilistiche.

Id. 15 seems to take up where *Id.* 14 left off, though we know nothing about the compositional order of the two poems or method of publication. The poems have the realm of the Ptolemies as their point of convergence, though the latter looks at Alexandria from a distance, while the former is the only surviving Hellenistic poem that actually describes the city. In *Id.* 15, in contrast to the private world of the drinking party, we have a religious event; the main characters are women, not men, and the featured monarch is Arsinoe II, not her brother/husband. The trajectory of *Id.* 14 and 15, taken together, bears some resemblance to that of Posidippus' roll. There is a movement toward Alexandria, now not from the eastern periphery of Alexander's empire, but from the Peloponnese and Syracuse.⁹¹ We also find a shift articulated over the course of several sections of epigrams from the male/war/Ptolemy to female/cult/Arsinoe. My supposition about the importance of the name, Cynisca, strengthens the similarity, because we would then also have a shift from the queens as victors in the Panhellenic games (in *Id.* 14 and Posidippus' *hippika*) to the queens implicitly associated with goddesses (in *Id.* 15 and Posidippus' *anathematika*). It is certainly possible that one poet imitated the internal dynamics of the other—for example, the transfer of glory (*kydos*) from mainland Greece to the land of the Ptolemies—, but it is equally possible that the patterns for treating imperial accomplishments, whether in the serious encomiastic mode or the more ironic genres of epigram or mime, were already well developed under Alexander and probably played out in similar ways in every Successor's court.

Id. 15's focus is initially on the city—its bustle, milling crowds, and cultural mix. The outside world of the poem is generally chaotic and confused, in contrast to the private domestic space of the opening and the public domestic space of Adonis' bower at the close of the poem. The king's role in reducing street crime, duly noted (*Id.* 15.47–50), is immediately juxtaposed to the arrival of the king's horsemen (15.51–52). Heedless as their passage threatens the milling bystanders, the horsemen introduce the world of war that Ptolemy's kingdom otherwise successfully keeps at a distance from the civilian population. As the women enter into the palace, external confusion disappears to be replaced with the scene of the court-devised *locus amoenus*. On view is a

⁹¹ The blend is idiosyncratic, and Griffiths' suggestion ((1979a) 109) that Gorgo and Praxinoa's pride in their native dialect (*Id.* 15.90–93) mirrors Theocritus' own introduction of Silician dialect and art forms in Alexandria is attractive.

tableau, and a singer to celebrate the festival of Adonis. The Ptolemaic Adonia is in essence a celebration of fertility, and the central figure analogous to dying gods like Dionysus and Osiris.⁹² Aphrodite with her dying lover reclines within a green bower, a space that is contrived to mimic the opulence of nature at its peak. The youth's annual union with Aphrodite and his death very obviously mirrors seasonal growth and decay, as the elements of the tableau emphasize: "beside him lie the choicest of the seasonal bounty trees bear, and delicate gardens that have been tended in silver baskets ..." (15.113–114). Within Theocritus' corpus, Adonis has close affinities with the figure of the dying Daphnis. In *Id.* 1 Daphnis is compared to Adonis (l. 109) and, like Adonis, Aphrodite attempts to revive him when he is dying (l. 138). Here "all winged and earthly creatures are beside (Adonis), and green bowers are laden with dill" (15.118–119). Arsinoe was associated with Aphrodite in cult, particularly her temple at Cape Zephyrium, where she takes on aspects of the Dioscuri, as a protecting marine goddess.⁹³ But Theocritus is more interested in exploring Aphrodite as a life force. Whether Theocritus is merely reflecting court culture or shaping its presentation to his own purposes, the second half of *Id.* 15 links Aphrodite, the queens, and Helen, all as enablers of fruitful *eros* (ll. 109–112). Aphrodite we see conferring immortality on Berenice I (Arsinoe's mother), and Arsinoe II, in the image of Helen, who in *Id.* 18 was married in her own *locus amoenus* (especially ll. 37–48). Issues of imperial self aggrandizement aside, Arsinoe's festival conforms to a pattern that we begin to see in *Id.* 14 and that is fully articulated in the encomium to Ptolemy, good kings (and queens) are distinguished not by war, but by the prosperity and fruitfulness of their lands. Arsinoe's *pleasance* is artificial, and perhaps her beautiful boy is a tongue-in-cheek parallel for the allusion to Ptolemy *erotikos*' mistress in *Id.* 14. But it is also both a reflection and a promise of ὄλβος and its proper disposition that is the subject of *Idyll* 17.

⁹² See Reed (2000) on the Ptolemaic Adonia.

⁹³ Posidippus celebrates Arsinoe-Aphrodite in two epigrams, one of which is in the new roll (38 and 113 A.-B.); Callimachus does so in epigram *HE* 1109ff. (ap. Athen. 318b) and in the *Lock of Berenice*, fr. 112.53–58 Pf.

6. *Id. 16 and 17*

The final pair of poems I wish to consider are *Id. 16* and *17*. They are the only two in the corpus (as we have it) in which kings are the featured subject, without mythological displacement or refraction through the eyes of ordinary individuals. *Id. 16* features Hiero II of Syracuse a figure of (apparently) incipient accomplishment, while *Id. 17* is addressed to Ptolemy II, who has already distinguished himself as ruler. It has been usual to construct a biography for Theocritus from these poems, regarding the first as belonging to a period in his life when he resided in Sicily and the second from residence in Alexandria.⁹⁴ It is possible to read *Id. 16* somewhat differently, however. Not as an encomium for Hiero or even a feint in that direction, but as a critique of historical events in Sicily and South Italy. The poem opens with the brilliant scene of Theocritus' poems, his Graces, returning in utter dejection, because no one cares to buy them (ll. 5–18). Next he critiques those who fail to use their wealth properly (ll. 14–34), listing sacrifice to the gods, hosting guests, and treating strangers kindly, and, as paramount, to honor the holy interpreters of the Muses (quoted above). Theocritus then proceeds to recount how the Muses (and poetry) preserve the good report of men after their deaths, providing the examples of Simonides (l. 44: θεῖος ἀοιδὸς ὁ Κήϊος, “the divine bard, the man from Ceos”) and other poets including Pindar and Homer (ll. 45–57). Simonides is especially relevant here because he apparently was a guest in the court of Hiero I of Syracuse, and his tomb was in Acragas.⁹⁵ The story of Simonides and the Scopadae, discussed above in the context of the Dioscuri, provides an immediate example not just of the poet's ability to praise, but of a tale that implies the poet's equal ability to blame. The final section of the poem is a prayer for the propitious outcome of war against the Carthaginians, led by Hiero (ll. 58–109). Victory holds the following expectations for Theocritus (*Id. 16.88–99*):

ἄσπεα δὲ προτέρωσι πάλιν ναίειτο πολίταις,
 δυσμενέων ὅσα χεῖρες ἐλωβήσαντο κατ' ἄκρας·
 ἄργους δ' ἐργάζονται τεθαλότας· αἱ δ' ἀνάριθμοι
 μῆλων χιλιάδες βοτάνῃ διαπιανθεῖσαι
 ἄμπεδιον βληχῶντο, βόες δ' ἀγελῆδὸν ἐς αὖλιν
 ἐρχόμεναι σκνιφαῖον ἐπισπεύδοιεν ὁδίταν·

⁹⁴ See, e.g., Gow (1952) vol. 1, xxv–vi.

⁹⁵ Pausan. 1.2.3 and Callim. fr. 64. 3–4 Pf.

νειοὶ δ' ἔκπονέοιντο ποτὶ σπόρον, ἀνίκα τέτιξ
 ποιμένας ἐνδίοις πεφυλαγμένους ὑψόθι δένδρων
 ἀχεῖ ἐν ἀκρεμόνεσσιν· ἀράχνια δ' εἰς ὅπλ' ἀράχναι
 λεπτὰ διαστήσαιντο, βοᾶς δ' ἔτι μὴδ' ὄνομ' εἴη.
 ὑψηλὸν δ' Ἰέρωνι κλέος φορέοιεν ἄοιδοί
 καὶ πόντου Σκυθικοῦ πέραν καὶ ὅθι πλατὺ τεῖχος
 ἀσφάλτῳ δῆσασα Σεμίραμις ἐμβασίλευεν.

May the towns be populated again by their former citizens, as many as the enemy's hands have utterly destroyed. May they till fertile fields, and countless thousands of sheep growing fat upon the pastures fill the plain with their bleating. May cattle in their herds returning to their stading hasten traveler at twilight. May the fallows be worked for seed while the cicada, watching the shepherds in the sun, sings high in the foliage of the trees. May spiders spin their fine webs over implements of war, and may the name of battle cease to exist. And may singers carry the repute of Hiero aloft and across the Scythian sea and where Semiramis bound the broad wall with pitch and ruled within.⁹⁶

Theocritus' prayer is for an end of the wars that have devastated Sicily. This cannot have been an occasional poem: the poet tells us that in his opening—his poems have returned home in despair, and it is difficult to imagine a context for its commission or performance. Rather it seems to be an expression of hope for the conditions that require an encomium, and even then it is not structured as a victory ode, full of Homeric allusion about defeat of the enemy. Scholars have taken this poetic reticence as evidence that Hiero II had few military accomplishments, but more likely it reflects Theocritus' central poetic interests. Peace is imagined not as triumph in battle (Agathocles and Pyrrhus had demonstrated the hollowness of victory) but as a return of the stability and fruitfulness epitomized by the pastoral landscape that is—poetically speaking—the precondition for song.

The *Ptolemy* is set out almost as a complete contrast to the Hiero poem. The *Hiero* begins by distinguishing the praises of the Muses and that of mortals: "Muses are goddesses, and goddesses sing of gods. We are mortal, let mortals sing of mortals" (*Id.* 16.3–4). The *Ptolemy* begins with the two in accord: "Let us begin from Zeus and with Zeus end in our poems, Muses". Zeus, the Muses, and Theocritus are

⁹⁶ The allusion to Babylon is likely to suggest Alexander and his conquests. Since he died there it may not be entirely felicitous. Note that in the *Ptolemy* Alexander is conqueror of the Persians (*Id.* 17.18–19) and now enjoying the banquet halls of Olympus.

seemingly united in the praise of Ptolemy.⁹⁷ Theocritus next comments on Ptolemy's lineage, beginning with the vignette of his father Soter supping with the Olympians, and his mother Berenice's parturition on Cos. Cos becomes the newborn's nurse, so that Cos as the epicenter for poetic inspiration seems to take Ptolemy to her bosom; this in contrast to the imperial rejection or ignoring of poets in the *Hiero*. Hiero is praised neither in terms of lineage nor of offspring, though the mention of the Scopadae and their bard, Simonides, indirectly conjures up the court of Hiero I, where Simonides was supposedly an honored guest. But Ptolemy is a true image of his father and will beget true sons—the line will remain intact as each generation distinguishes itself.⁹⁸ This mirror imaging is done in terms of battle—*αἰχμητὰ Πτολεμαῖε, αἰχμητᾶ Πτολεμαίῳ*, “warrior Ptolemy, to Ptolemy the warrior” (ll. 56–57)—though it is not much developed. Theocritus almost immediately turns to the theme of prosperity. Ptolemy's lands are prosperous in precisely the ways that Theocritus prays Sicily's land might become (*Id.* 17.79–81 and 98–101):

ἀλλ' οὔτις τόσα φύει ὅσα χθαμαλά Αἴγυπτος,
 Νεῖλος ἀναβλύζων διερὼν ὅτε βόλακα θρύπτει,
 οὐδέ τις ἄστεα τόσσα βροτῶν ἔχει ἔργα δαέντων.

...
 οὐ γάρ τις δηίων πολυκῆτεα Νεῖλον ὑπερβάς
 περὶ δὲ ἐν ἀλλοτρίαισι βοᾶν ἐστάσατο κώμαις,
 οὐδέ τις αἰγιαλόνδε θοᾶς ἐξήλατο ναός
 θωρηχθεὶς ἐπὶ βουσὶν ἀνάρσιος Αἰγυπτίησιν·

no [country] produces as much as the Egyptian fields do when the Nile inundates and breaks up the soil, and no [country] has as many towns with skilled mortals

...
 no foe comes by land having crossed the herd-rich Nile to raise the battle cry in villages not his own, no foe leaps from his swift ship onto the shore and harries with armed violence the herds of Egypt.

The wishful optatives of the *Hiero* (“may the towns be populated”, “may they till the fields”, “may the name of battle cease to exist”) become strong assertions in the form of anaphoric negatives (“no [country]

⁹⁷ See my discussion in (2003) 147–170.

⁹⁸ Hiero II did not come from a prepossessing line, but neither did Ptolemy. How to celebrate lineage seems to be more a reflection of the poem's overall strategy than of external facts.

produces as much”, “no foe comes by land ... to raise the battle cry”, “no foe ... harries with armed violence ...”). Finally, Ptolemy uses his wealth appropriately: he honors the gods, his parents, and poets in language similar to *Id.* 16.29 (ll. 112–116):

οὐδὲ Διονύσου τις ἀνὴρ ἱεροῦς κατ’ ἀγῶνας
 ἔκετ’ ἐπιστάμενος λιγυρὰν ἀναμέλψαι αἰοιδάν,
 ᾗ οὐ δωτίαν ἀντάξιον ὥπασε τέχνας.
 Μουσάων δ’ ὑποφῆται αἰείδοντι Πτολεμαῖον
 ἀντ’ εὐεργεσίης.

No man comes to the sacred contests of Dionysus knowing how to lift up his clear sounding song without receiving a gift worthy of his craft. And the interpreters of the Muses sing of Ptolemy in exchange for his benefaction.

7. Conclusion

But are these deliberate or accidental contrasts? The repertory of the encomiast must have been rather like the sophist’s store of *dissoi logoi*—certain carefully wrought themes, always available to be fitted into whatever context was required. In that case, *Hiero* operates as a simple inversion of the tropes of the *Ptolemy*—Hiero’s world a failed landscape ravaged by war, Ptolemy’s a prosperous landscape maintained in peace. But there is another, intriguing possibility raised by Kathryn Gutzwiller’s discussion of the ordering of a subsection of Theocritus’ poems. She infers that the order of the idylls in the 5th-cent. AD Antinoe papyrus derived from three earlier and separately organized book rolls. The hypothetical roll B would have included: *Id.* 16, [*Berenice*], *Id.* 10, 14, 13 12, 2, 18, 15, 26, 24, 17, and was “an artistically designed poetry book.” This consists of a central core of four poems on male erotic experience (*Id.* 10, 14, 13, 12) plus four (*Id.* 2, 18, 15, 26) on women’s experience, flanked by two introductory poems (16, *Berenice*) and two closing poems (*Id.* 24, 17). She adduces a number of arguments for the *Hiero* as an opening poem: the posture of seeking a patron, the delineation of the duty of the Muses, the personification of his poems as “Charites”, which could easily serve as the name of the whole group of poems.⁹⁹ If *Id.* 16 opened a roll and 17 closed it, the poems would necessarily have been read contrastively: Hiero’s world becomes a warning of what war could bring to the Ptolemies, while the prosperity of the

⁹⁹ I paraphrase her argument ((1991) 141).

Ptolemies can be read as a model for Sicilian prosperity in the event Hiero should succeed. Whether or not Theocritus himself was responsible for the arrangement, a broader theme emerges if these two poems bracketed a poetry collection, namely the parlous state of Sicily and South Italy in the early 3rd century in comparison to the thriving lands of the Ptolemies.

The separate pastoral poems lend themselves to a similar reading. Gutzwiller's hypothetical roll A includes "1, 5, 6, 7, and in uncertain order 3, 4, 8, 9, 11".¹⁰⁰ However the pastorals were grouped, two poems (*Id.* 4 and 5) provoke comparison of ancient and modern social conditions in South Italy by setting the scenes near Croton and Sybaris and evoking the Pyrrhic wars.¹⁰¹ *Id.* 7 sets Ptolemaic Cos, with Ptolemaic poets in the center of the Theocritean *locus amoenus*, while *Id.* 6 and 11 give us the alarming figure of Polyphemus—the conspicuous consumer, crypto-tyrant, and would-be lover with dire consequence. Of course, these may not be Theocritean arrangements at all. He may never have collected his own poems, or he may have organized them differently. Whatever the actual circumstances of the collection, it seems fair to conclude that there is a consistent pattern of myth, allusion, and inter-text that is not limited by genre or poetic type and that constructs the ruler and the pastoral landscape as mutually interdependent. Theocritus' rulers are to be judged in terms of the prosperity of their land and flocks, not their monuments or armies. Sicily and South Italy provide one example—of a world of poverty, war, hubristic behaviors, and mythologized over-consuming tyrants, where the "interpreters of the Muses" lack respect. For Theocritus Cos is the idealized model—Cos nurtures the king, who in turn nurtures his land—constructed as a pastoral landscape, in which poets can flourish and in turn celebrate (and thus nurture) the king.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.* The inclusion of the spurious *Id.* 8 and 9 suggests prima facie an editorial ordering.

¹⁰¹ And Virgil could easily have understood them this way, since the Pyrrhic wars were treated in Ennius' *Annales*.

IS THERE URBAN PASTORAL? THE CASE OF THEOCRITUS' *ID.* 15

NITA KREVANS

Theocritus' *Id.* 15, "Syracusan Women, or Women at the Adonis Festival", follows two Alexandrian housewives on an expedition to the celebration of the Adonia at the palace of the Ptolemies. Gorgo and Praxinoa meet at the latter's home, then set off to the palace, complaining about their husbands, their servants, and the crowds in the streets. Once inside the palace, the two women admire tapestries and an Adonis tableau; the feast for their eyes is then followed by a feast for their ears—a song for Adonis, performed by a professional singer, and quoted in its entirety. The poem concludes with a comment by one of the women, praising the singer and offering a prayer to Adonis—with a final jab at her grumpy husband sandwiched in between the two encomiastic statements.

This idyll is often showcased as an example of urban mime in the Theocritean corpus.¹ What that means, in modern critical terms, is that *Id.* 15 belongs to the "non-bucolic" half of the Theocritean corpus, a section that sometimes appears to be partitioned off from the "bucolic" poems by an adamant wall.² Thus Griffiths (1979a), Burton (1995) and Hunter (1996), all of whom treat 15 at great length, barely touch on *Id.* 1 and 3–7; meanwhile Halperin (1983a) and Gutzwiller (1991) discuss 15 only in passing, while Hubbard (1998) does not even mention it. Since Griffiths's focus is court poetry, Burton's this very category of urban mime, and Hunter's Theocritean reworkings of earlier literary forms, their interest in 15 is understandable. Conversely, Halperin, Gutzwiller and Hubbard are all concerned with examining Theocritus' role in the development of pastoral, and therefore focus on the so-called "bucolic" idylls.

¹ E.g. Horstmann (1976) 18, Goldhill (1991) 274, Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 161.

² As noted (and decried) by Hutchinson (1988) 144–146, who goes on to frame his entire discussion of Theocritus as a refutation of this dichotomy.

Reasons for this bifurcated view of the idylls are not difficult to find. The retroactive canonization of Theocritus as the father of pastoral by the later western tradition, beginning with Virgil, is explanation enough; add to that Theocritus' own tendency to use special programmatic terminology in the bucolic pieces and the notably unrealistic erudition of his herdsmen, and it is no wonder that the marked term in Theocritean studies became "bucolic"; poems like *Id.* 15 are defined as negatives: not-bucolic. The bifurcation is also practical, in a certain sense: scholars of pastoral find a group of idylls (genuine and spurious) neatly sequestered for their use, while critics interested in patronage or myth turn to the higher-numbered poems.

In the exercise that follows, therefore, I acknowledge that the generalizations I will challenge are often helpful. Nevertheless, in any examination of pastoral, and especially of Theocritean pastoral, it is surely useful to conduct the occasional test: what, precisely, prevents a given poem in the corpus from being considered "pastoral"? *Id.* 15, as it happens, is a promising subject for such a test. While its setting is urban, its structure and content have more in common with notably bucolic idylls such as 1, 3, and 7 than with the other urban poems (*Id.* 2, 14) or the other explicitly Ptolemaic poems (*Id.* 14, 17). Nor should we allow the traditional exclusion of females from pastoral to discourage a consideration of poem 15.³ After all, if we define as "not-pastoral" a poem about city-dwellers who attend a festival celebrating an agricultural deity and hear a song about a dying herdsman, we run the risk of excluding *Id.* 7 from the bucolic canon.

1. *Id.* 15 and *Herodas* 4: two urban mimes?

An examination of the structure of *Id.* 15 reveals the complicated relationship between this poem and other surviving examples of urban mime. The first, most basic structural question involves what ancient commentators on both the *Idylls* and the *Eclogues* called "modes" (χαρακτῆρες). They divide poetry into three possible types: "narrative" (διηγηματικός), in which only the poet speaks; "dramatic" (δραματικός), in which the poet is silent and only characters speak, and "mixed" (μικ-

³ On the prevalence of female characters in urban mime, see Finnegan (1992). *Id.* 15 has been studied as an example of 'female' poetics; e.g. Skinner (2001), Griffiths (1979a) 116–123.

τός), a combination.⁴ The hexameter idylls of Theocritus fall into these modes as follows: *Id.* 12, 13, 16, 17, 24, and 26 are narrative; *Id.* 1–5, 10, 14 and 15 are dramatic; *Id.* 6, 11, 18 and 22 are mixed. *Id.* 7 is either dramatic (an in-character monologue, like 2 and 3), or, if Simichidas is taken to be the voice of the poet, “mixed”.⁵ These labels are sometimes difficult to assign. *Id.* 24, for example, quotes a long prophecy by Teiresias (ll. 73–100); should it be set in the “mixed” category? They are also deceptive, obscuring the strong resemblance between *Id.* 5 and 6 (poetic contests) or 22 and 24 (hymns). Nevertheless, as a preliminary sorting mechanism, the modes are useful. They may also have generic implications: the Virgilian commentators assign the “narrative” mode to the *Georgics*, “dramatic” to tragedy and comedy, and “mixed” to the *Aeneid*. All three modes, they point out, are found in the *Eclogues*.

Id. 15 belongs in the dramatic group. There is no narrator, and the two main characters, Gorgo and Praxinoa, remain resolutely at center stage throughout the piece. This mode is congruent with the notion of 15 as an urban mime, especially since the two leading characters are appropriately low and domestic: middle-class females. It is worth noting, however, that although the Virgilian commentators designate all three modes as proper in bucolic, Theocritus has a distinct preference. Of the idylls traditionally considered “pastoral”, most are either fully dramatic (*Id.* 1, 3, 4, 5, possibly 7) or largely so (6).

The dramatic mode, then, cannot be used to divide pastoral idylls from urban mimes in the Theocritean corpus. And in fact, a detailed examination of this particular version of the ‘dramatic mode’ reveals a number of odd features, features that do not seem typical of urban mime. There are three scene changes, for example (15.1–43, Praxinoa’s house; 44–64, the streets on the way to the palace; 65–77, the entrance to the palace; 78–149, inside the palace). An unusually large number of secondary characters, both silent and speaking, appear and disappear (the baby, two maids, three male strangers, a troop of soldiers, an old woman, and the performer at the festival). Finally, a substantial portion of the piece (45 lines, in a poem of just under 150 lines) is taken up by the elaborate inset song whose tone and theme are distinctly different from the surrounding portrait of the two housewives and the *realia* of their daily lives—not to mention the *realia* of Alexandria’s crowded

⁴ Σ Theocr. *Prolegom.* D, Servius *ad Ecl.* 3.1, Isid. *Etym.* 8.7.11. These and further similar passages cited in Wendel’s (1914) *Prolegomena*.

⁵ On the complex implications of the last item see, e.g., Gutzwiller (1991) 158–171.

streets. To the extent that we can use the surviving mimes of Herodas as yardsticks, these discontinuities of scene, personnel and diction already mark 15 as atypical.⁶ A comparison with the other two ‘urban’ mimes of Theocritus, *Id.* 2 and 14, also reveals 15 as odd man out. Both take place on a single set; both present a unified dramatic action; both limit the cast onstage to a few characters; both maintain a consistent tone—although this tone is more elevated in *Id.* 2, where Simaetha’s spell and lament offer numerous formal poetic features such as refrain, anaphora, and epic allusions.

Even more atypical of ‘urban mime’ is the inclusion of a poet as a speaking character. The singer’s profession and her elaborate, hymnic style put her in a different realm from the two protagonists; she provides a learned *ekphrasis* of the Adonis tableau to supplement (and undermine) Gorgo and Praxinoa’s admiration. Gorgo’s quasi-ritual call for silence emphasizes this change (ll. 96–99):

σίγη, Πραξινοά· μέλλει τὸν Ἀδωνιν αἰδεῖν
 ἅ τ᾽ Ἀργείας θυγάτηρ, πολὺνιδρις αἰιδός,
 ἅτις καὶ πέρουσιν τὸν ἰάλεμον ἀρίστευσε.
 φθεγξέται τι, σάφ’ οἶδα, καλόν· διαχρέμπεται ἤδη.

Quiet, Praxinoa; the Argive woman’s daughter is going to sing the Adonis song, a learned singer, the one who won the prize for her dirge last year. She’ll perform something lovely, I’m sure. She’s getting ready to sing right now.

The internal boundary defined by Gorgo’s request is especially noticeable because the two previous speakers have also asked someone to stop talking: an unnamed man asks the women to stop chattering in their broad dialect (15.87–88), and Praxinoa immediately tells the stranger to mind his own business (15.89–95). The unnamed man’s notable failure to silence Praxinoa (at seven full lines, her reply is the second-longest speech in the poem to this point) makes Gorgo’s success all the more dramatic and sets up the shift in register that characterizes both the Adonis song itself and its reception by the women.

Herodas’ fourth mimiamb provides an instructive (and frequently adduced) comparandum to *Id.* 15.⁷ In Herodas’ poem, two women and a maidservant visit a temple of Asclepius. After an opening prayer

⁶ The setting is usually fixed in other Theocritean idylls as well, but a similar change of scene occurs in *Id.* 3; see Gow (1952) *ad* 3.6.

⁷ See e.g. Zanker (2004) 85–86, Skinner (2001), Burton (1995) 96–108, Goldhill (1994), Luria (1963) 407–413 with further refs.

by one of the women, both women comment on statues and paintings in the temple and, like modern tourists in a Florentine church, have the temple attendant (νεωκόρος) open an inner room so that they may see additional artworks. The attendant announces that the sacrifice has been favorable, and with a final command to wrap up the leftovers from the sacrifice the worshipper and her companions leave.⁸

The poems do contain a number of obvious common themes, although the basic plot—housewives visiting a religious site—may not be as unique as the accidents of survival make it appear. Titles from comedy and tragedy suggest that the “admiring pilgrim” motif appeared across genres,⁹ and Sophron apparently used the same theme in his “Women at the Isthmian Festival”. Although the scholiast tells us *Id.* 15 was based on Sophron’s poem,¹⁰ we know almost nothing of the earlier piece beyond the title, and both Cunningham and Gow are reluctant to see Sophron as anything more than a general model.¹¹ In addition to the strikingly similar characters and settings, however, both Herodas 4 and Theocritus’ *Id.* 15 contain extended passages abusing slaves (Theocr. 15.27–32, Herodas 4.41–51), a topos that appears frequently in Herodas’ mimes.¹² More significantly, in both poems the emphasis is not on the women as worshippers but as art critics. The female protagonists produce naive *ekphraseis* describing statues, tapestries and paintings—*ekphraseis* that praise, in typical Hellenistic fashion, the realistic effect of the depictions and the exactness of the artists’ technique.¹³ “You would say the statues could talk” (Herodas 4.33), or are “alive, not woven” (Theocr. 15.83); ἀληθιναί ... χεῖρες / ἐς πάντ’ Ἀπελλέω γράμ-

⁸ Distribution and names of speakers in the mime are difficult to determine precisely, and Headlam-Knox (1922) *ad* Herodas 4.94 attribute the final, rather greedy, comment to the attendant, but Cunningham (1971) *ad* Herodas 4.86–95 argues persuasively that these lines belong to the sacrificer.

⁹ Comedy: Epicharmus (according to Athenaeus, 8.362b); tragedy: Eur. *Ion* 184–219; possibly a lost satyr play of Aeschylus, “The Spectators, or Isthmia-goers”. See Cunningham (1971) 128, Skinner (2001) 203–206.

¹⁰ Σ Theocr. 15, *arg.*

¹¹ See Gow (1952) vol. 2, 265–266, Cunningham (1971) 128, Burton (1995) 221 n. 69, Hunter (1996) 118–119.

¹² E.g. Herodas 5 *passim*; 6.2–11, 12–15; 7.5–13; 8.1–14. Finnegan (1992) 29–30 notes that Herodas often uses such passages to depict his female characters as vicious and sadistic.

¹³ The most famous example of Hellenistic poetry praising verisimilitude in the visual arts is probably the series of epigrams on Myron’s cow (*AP* 9.713–742); see *HE* vol. 2, 63–64, Gutzwiller (1998) 245–250; more generally Zanker (1987) 39–54.

ματ', "true are the hands of Apelles in all his paintings" (Herodas 4.72–73); ποῖοι ζωογράφοι τὰχρῖβέα γράμματ' ἔγραψαν, "what artists-from-life that created their paintings so exactly" (Theocr. 15.81). The marginal social status of these would-be art critics creates a humorous contradiction Herodas and Theocritus enjoy exploiting: the women function as poetic equivalents of the realistic art, everyday objects who behave in such a lifelike way that their reaction to the art provokes in its turn the same reaction from the elite reader: "you would say that was a real housewife talking".¹⁴

The differences between the poems, however, are significant. First—and these are the criteria that would have been most meaningful to an ancient critic—the two poems are at opposite ends of a generic spectrum defined by meter. *Id.* 15 is epos; Herodas 4 is iamb.¹⁵ Thus *Id.* 15 announces itself as hymn or epic, and then proceeds to undermine and contradict that announcement with its urban, domestic setting, its dramatic mode, and its bourgeois heroines. Iamb, by contrast, has a long tradition of depicting low characters and ordinary activities. While the invocation that opens Herodas 4 initially suggests that Herodas will elevate iamb as Theocritus has lowered epos, that promise is not fulfilled. Cynno's prayer is cultic and minimalist, not literary;¹⁶ moreover, it rapidly deteriorates into the same sort of quasi-comic lament about the household budget found at the opening of *Id.* 15 (Herodas 4.14–19; cf. Theocr. 15.8–10, 15–20). *Id.* 15 is thus more generically complex than Herodas 4, whose combination of mime and iamb is less inherently unstable.

The unique structure of *Id.* 15 also distinguishes it from Herodas' mime. *Mimiamb* 4 takes place in one location: the temple of Asclepius. The revelation of additional votive artwork at l. 55 is accomplished through pulling back a curtain, requiring no change of scene. *Id.* 15, with its processional plot, offers not one but two pairs of opposing backdrops: Praxinoa's suburban house against the Ptolemies' elegant palace, and Alexandria's mobbed, noisy streets against the secluded, luxuriant bower of Adonis. As I shall argue below, those contrasts make possible the effects of pastoral in a city poem.

¹⁴ Goldhill (1994) 222; but see Skinner (2001) 212–213.

¹⁵ This important distinction between Theocritean "mime-epos" and Herodean mimiamb (each, in its verse form, departing from Sophron's more prosaic model) is discussed by Stanzel (1998).

¹⁶ Cunningham (1971) *ad* Herodas 4.1–20.

It is the presence of the singer, however, that makes the two poems most dissimilar. Herodas does not mark either his worshipper or the temple attendant as a poet; their speech is not distinguished from that of other characters and their invocations produce no aesthetic (or spiritual) reaction in any of the other characters. Just as Cynno's prayer to Asclepius is very much like the address real worshippers are known to have used, so, too, the attendant's blessing is perfunctory and repetitive—indeed, its opening formula has already been travestied in Aristophanes' comedies.¹⁷ At the end of their visit, the women leave the temple talking about packing up the rest of the offering, with Apelles and Asclepius equally forgotten.¹⁸

The Adonis singer is quite a different creature from Cynno and the *neokoros*. She is introduced as a prizewinning performer (ἄτις καὶ πέρυσιν τὸν ἰάλεμον ἀρίστευσε, “the one who won the prize for her dirge last year”, 15.98) and praised explicitly the moment she has finished singing (τὸ χρέμα σοφώτατον ἡ θήλεια / ὀλβία ὅσσα ἴσατι, πανολβία ὥς γλυκὺ φωνεῖ, “what a clever thing [the] female is—blessed to be so wise, twice blessed to sing so sweetly”, 15.145–146). Her composition is full of the same devices that characterize formal song in the bucolic idylls: apostrophe (15.124–125), anaphora (15.112–113, 139–142), alliteration (15.102, 118, 122, etc.), epithets (15.101–102, 128, 138, etc.), similes (15.110, 121, 125).¹⁹ It is distinguished metrically from the rest of the poem, as well; Hunter in fact argues that the song uses a combination of more formal hexametric practice, paratactic syntax, and stanza-length internal divisions to imitate lyric performance in contrast to the more realistic dialogue sections of *Id.* 15.²⁰ Finally, as commentators frequently note,

¹⁷ Cunningham (1971) *ad* Herodas 4.79.

¹⁸ Burton (1995) 105–106 contrasts the aesthetic and religious experiences in Herodas 4 and *Id.* 15 as “egoism” *vs* a public and communal experience.

¹⁹ The song gets mixed reviews from modern critics, but recent scholarship has inclined more and more to defend it. See Davies (1995) and Hunter (1996) 123–126 for a summary of the various opinions with further references.

²⁰ Hunter (1996) 128, who thus disagrees with Gow (1952) vol. 2, 16; Hunter describes *Id.* 15 as using a ‘rough’ hexameter for the dialogue portion of the poem (119) as an approximation of Sophron’s rhythmic prose. In addition to the formal features listed by Hunter as characterizing the Adonis song, it should also be noted that *Id.* 15 contains an unusually large number of mid-line speaker changes in the dialogue portion of the poem. This practice, too, is in line with that found in *Id.* 14 and in the surviving mimes of Herodas, but it cannot be used to separate “urban” from “bucolic” idylls, since this device appears also in *Id.* 5 where it serves, as here, to help distinguish ‘prose’ from ‘song’ within the hexameter poem: the split line in *Id.* 5 occurs immediately prior to the poetic contest (5.66, with two speaker changes). Split lines do not appear in *Id.* 1 or

her song is effective.²¹ It silences Praxinoa, who never speaks again. It evokes admiration from Gorgo, couched in terms even more extravagant than the earlier praise for the tapestry weavers (σοφόν τι χοῦν' ἀνθρώπου, 15.83; topped by τὸ χοῦν σοφώτατον, 15.145). The conclusion of the poem juxtaposes Gorgo's hungry, bad-tempered husband and the beautiful Adonis—and it is Adonis who gets the last word, in a simple, symmetrical line that echoes the closing line of the singer's hymn: χαῖρε, Ἄδων ἀγαπατέ, καὶ ἐς χαίροντας ἀφικνεῖ (15.149, "Farewell, dear Adonis, and may we be well when you return").²²

In spite of the many similarities to Herodas 4, then, *Id.* 15 cannot be completely described by the phrase "urban mime". First, the movable setting is unparalleled in Herodas; the closest equivalents are *Id.* 3 and 7—in 3, a dramatic idyll, the scene actually shifts; in 7, also a journey to a religious festival, the narrator includes descriptions of several different locations. More importantly, the presence of a fictional poet introduces a reflexive, self-conscious note absent from Herodas 4. The Adonis song moves *Id.* 15 out of the realm of mime and aligns it closely with other idylls whose characters can sing back to their creator—that is, with the magical *Id.* 2 and with the pastoral idylls 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 10 and 11.

2. Pastoral and bucolic

Debate about the nature of pastoral is a longstanding scholarly exercise. Is it a genre? A mode? A convention? Does it require a particular attitude towards nature—or, at least, a rustic setting? Some influential definitions of the term are notoriously abstract, such as Empson's "putting the complex into the simple" or Poggioli's "double longing after innocence and happiness".²³ While William Empson and Renato Poggioli use broader criteria than many other critics, they do represent the general tendency for scholars working in the European tradition to frame

4; there is one additional instance at *Id.* 10.15, although in this idyll Theocritus marks his inset songs by using formal invocation in the first line of each (10.24, 42). For Theocritean hexametric practice more generally, see Hunter (1996) 29–30; Fantuzzi (1995b) with further references.

²¹ E.g. Burton (1995) 117, Hutchinson (1988) 153, Horstmann (1976) 56.

²² Compare, in the singer's closing at 15.143–144, the address to "dear Adonis" (φίλ' Ἄδωνι), the phrase καὶ ἐς νέωτ', the use of ἀφίκη, the feminine participle εὐθυμεύσας, anticipating χαίροντας, and see also Goldhill (1991) 276.

²³ Empson (1935) 23, Poggioli (1975) 14.

the problem of defining pastoral as the central enterprise in reading pastoral texts—not surprising, perhaps, when analyzing a tradition that can surface in anything from a picaresque novel to an epigram. Empson's 1935 title—*Some Versions of Pastoral*—is only slightly more assertive than Paul Alpers' 1996 *What is Pastoral?* Both works, as their titles suggest, operate on the assumption that the process of finding the answer to Alpers' question is in and of itself the correct critical method for studying pastoral.

Since the classical material is more restricted in form, it is at first surprising that scholars of Greek and Roman pastoral seem to feel equally obligated to devote large sections of their argument to the definition and history of the term.²⁴ In many cases, however, the task of definition is not one of inclusion (as it was with Empson and Alpers) but of exclusion. The later tradition must be jettisoned; classical pastoral must be studied on its own terms, free of the anachronistic influence of Spenser and Milton. Classicists therefore often prefer the term "bucolic", a term with fewer misleading medieval and renaissance connotations—and one which can be defined empirically by examining Theocritus' use of βουκολικός and related words as programmatic terms in certain poems.²⁵ In Theocritean studies even Virgil must be excluded; "pastoral" is frequently represented as a post-Theocritean development, one that only retroactively defines the bucolic idylls as different from their comrades.²⁶ This formulation has an ironic corollary: Theocritus himself becomes a 'naive' poet (in the Schillerian sense). Like the Polyphemus of *Id.* 11, who sings wistfully to an audience of *Odyssey*-readers about obtaining help in his courtship from a seafaring stranger (*Id.* 11.61), Theocritus composes poetry for an audience of critics who have read Virgil.

While there is general agreement among classical scholars that pastoral and bucolic must be distinguished, there is considerably less agreement about the details of enforcing that distinction.²⁷ Halperin, one of

²⁴ E.g. Rosenmeyer (1969), chs. 1–2; Halperin (1983a), chs. 1–4; Gutzwiller (1991), chap. 9.

²⁵ So Van Groningen (1958–1959) and Halperin (1983a); but see e.g. Alpers (1996) 145–161, Hubbard (1998) 20–21.

²⁶ So especially Rosenmeyer (1969) and Halperin (1983a), but also Hutchinson (1988) 144–146. See further Gutzwiller (1991) 6–9. Fantuzzi (1998) points out that the ps.-Theocritean *Id.* 8 has already 'sentimentalized' his source before the more famous Virgilian transformation.

²⁷ The best discussion remains Alpers (1990).

the first to consider the problem systematically, proposed an extreme solution: the hexameter idylls are nearly all “bucolic”, including Simaetha’s urban magic (*Id.* 2), the myth of Hylas (*Id.* 13), and the triumph of the infant Heracles (*Id.* 24). Bucolic emerges not from the presence of herdsmen or from terminology derived from herding, but simply from a generic contrast between the ironically humble Theocritean epos and its Homeric forebears. Pastoral, meanwhile, is given an elaborate definition with specific reference to herdsmen (although the definition then expands to include abstract contrasts between, e.g., simplicity and civilization).²⁸

Others, more willing than Halperin to partition the idylls on the basis of some form of proto-pastoral sensibility, still cannot agree on an exact list of “bucolic” idylls. Van Groningen, who first raised the problem of the term “bucolic”, admits (among the genuine idylls) 1 and 3–11; Van Sickle seems tempted to add *Id.* 2 to *Id.* 1 and 3–7; Gutzwiller treats *Id.* 1, 3–7 and 11; Hubbard adds *Id.* 10. Most recently, Fantuzzi and Hunter point out that thematic coherence is not the whole story: what they call “serious bucolic idylls” (1, 3–7) must be distinguished on metrical grounds from the more parodic *Id.* 10 and 11.²⁹ It is easy to see why the list is constantly shifting. *Id.* 2, although set in the city, has strong affinities with the ultra-bucolic *Id.* 1; *Id.* 4 contains no singing; *Id.* 10 is about reapers, not herdsmen; *Id.* 5 is far coarser than the others; *Id.* 11 is narrated by Theocritus in his own voice, and the inset shepherd’s song is the bumbling composition of the mythic Cyclops, Polyphemus. The ancient evidence, meanwhile, is on Halperin’s side: distinctly non-bucolic idylls such as 13 are cited by scholiasts as coming from “Theocritus’ bucolics”, and Virgil, in addition to incorporating the urban *Id.* 2 wholesale into the *Eclogues*, includes multiple allusions to *Id.* 15, 17, 18 and 24.³⁰ It would not be difficult, then, to make an argument that *Id.* 15 is “bucolic”, in the sense that it is more like the idylls which explicitly use that terminology than it is unlike them.³¹

²⁸ Halperin (1983a) 70–71 (definition of pastoral) 118–257 (description of Theocritean bucolic).

²⁹ Van Groningen (1958–1959) 300–301, Van Sickle (1976) 21, Gutzwiller (1991), Hubbard (1998) 20–21, Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 153.

³⁰ Hylas: Σ Apoll.Rhod. *Arg.* 1.1234; on the use of the term “bucolic” as a title for Theocritus’ *Idylls* see Gutzwiller (1996a). Catalogue of Virgilian echoes of Theocritus: Posch (1969) 15–27.

³¹ This is Halperin’s (1983a) conclusion, adapted by Hutchinson (1988) 150–213.

What I propose to do, however, is both more and less ambitious than asserting that *Id.* 15 is a bucolic poem. Pastoral is a term with far broader scope than bucolic—a term defined in widely varying ways by a number of influential critics. It is not implausible, therefore, that some modern descriptions of pastoral might include *Id.* 15. In fact, I have selected three such descriptions: Alpers' "representative anecdote", Thomas Rosenmeyer's "bucolic symmetry", and Poggioli's notion of "retreat". Poggioli offers easy access to the champion of *Id.* 15; Alpers and Rosenmeyer present more of a challenge. But in all cases, I will argue, the 'pastorality' of *Id.* 15 goes beyond the presence of one or two motifs associated with later European forms of the genre. *Id.* 15 is pastoral in a fundamental and programmatic sense, in spite of its urban setting, and deserves to take its place alongside *Id.* 1 and 7 as a central text in Theocritean poetics.

3. *Three versions of pastoral in Id. 15*

3a. *The shepherd*

I begin with the most difficult case to prove: *Id.* 15 as a poem about shepherds and their songs. Alpers, in his book *What is Pastoral?*, makes two important observations about the nature of pastoral. First, he argues that the essence of pastoral is not its setting, but its characters: "we will have a far truer idea of pastoral if we take its representative anecdote to be herdsmen and their lives, rather than landscape or idealized nature".³² Second, he argues that the notion of "convention" in pastoral—the artificial world of singing shepherds, contests, and rustic prizes—depends on the root meaning of "convene", that is, on the tendency of pastoral to convene figures not initially present in the poem. Literally, the poems convene fictional listeners to hear and judge the songs; figuratively, the poems convene dead or absent shepherds—and, by extension, the earlier pastoral poets those shepherds represent.³³ Virgil thus 'convenes' Theocritus; Theocritus, who has no pastoral predecessor, creates his own by mythologizing heroic herdsmen-poets: Daph-

³² Alpers (1996) 22. For the notion of the "representative anecdote", see his discussion on pp. 13–21.

³³ Alpers (1996) 79–93, more fully elaborated in Alpers (1983).

nis in *Id.* 1; Daphnis and Comatas in *Id.* 7.³⁴ The ‘conventions’ (read: artificial limitations) of the pastoral world therefore depend on an internal and external audience who accept the invitation of the poet and who recognize the importance of poetic inheritance in the pastoral tradition.³⁵

Are there herdsmen in *Id.* 15? The first, simplistic answer is that they appear at ll. 126–127, where the singer, describing the tableau of Adonis and Aphrodite, turns to the crimson coverlets on the couch and comments:

ἃ Μίλατος ἐρεῖ χὼ τὰν Σαμίαν καταβόσκων,
“ἔστρωται κλίνα τῶδ’ ὠνιδι τῷ καλῷ ἄμμιν”.

Miletus will say, and the man pasturing his herd on Samos: “Fair Adonis’ couch is covered by our handiwork”.

Even if this were the only appearance of herdsmen, it could be argued that they are significant figures as the source of the wool mentioned frequently elsewhere in the poem. Gorgo and Praxinoa both allude to the preparation of wool for spinning at the beginning of the idyll (ll. 16, 19–20).³⁶ The spinning itself then appears at l. 27, where Praxinoa orders her maid to pick it up before the cat lies on it: αἱ γαλέαι μαλακῶς χορήξοντι καθεύδειν, “cats like to sleep where it is soft” (l. 28). This passage, in turn, is explicitly recalled immediately before the reference to the Samian shepherd: the crimson covers are μαλακώτεροι ὕπνω, “softer than sleep” (15.125). More generally, the constant references to cloth and weaving in the poem (15.34–38, 69–71, 78–83) have often led critics to compare both Praxinoa’s dress and the tapestries in the palace to the goatherd’s cup in *Id.* 1, as crafted objects that are set against the performance of a song.³⁷

Underneath the coverlets supplied by the anonymous Milesian and Samian shepherds, however, there is another herdsman: Adonis. The juxtaposition of the ‘real’ shepherds who provide the wool for the coverlets and the mythic shepherd in the tableau is surely deliberate, as is the blatant echo of Praxinoa’s description of the soft, sleep-inducing wool.

³⁴ On the invocation of the literary past in *Id.* 7 see Hunter (1996) 20–28; Krevans (1983) and discussion below; Fantuzzi, this volume, pp. 236–240.

³⁵ On this last cf. Hubbard (1998) 21, who comments: “bucolic, more than any other poetic type, is *about* poetic influence and succession”.

³⁶ On the meaning of the items purchased in l. 16 and more generally on the motif of textile-work in the poem see Whitehorne (1995).

³⁷ E.g. Burton (1995) 108–109.

Within the song, female city-dwellers such as Praxinoa and Gorgo, who work with fleeces to produce woven artifacts, are replaced by their male pastoral equivalents, the shepherds of Miletus and Samos. Housewives and fictional herdsmen alike offer the fruits of their labor to the mythic figure at the center of Arsinoe's tableau.

Adonis' status as a shepherd is not made explicit in *Id.* 15, although the mention of the herdsmen at l. 126 would remind the audience that Adonis, too, pastures flocks.³⁸ Normally, however, Theocritus takes care to emphasize Adonis' traditional occupation. The lovesick goatherd of *Id.* 3 includes Adonis in a list of rustic heroes who succeeded in their wooing (3.46–48):

τὰν δὲ καλὰν Κυθήρειαν ἐν ὄρεσι μῆλα νομεύων
οὐχ οὕτως Ὠδωνίς ἐπὶ πλεόν ἄγαγε λύσσας,
ὥστ' οὐδὲ φθιμνόν νιν ἄτερ μαζοῖο τίθητι;

as for fair Cytherea, as he herded his flocks on the mountains, did not
Adonis drive her to such frenzy that even after his death she keeps him
at her breast?³⁹

A similar reference is found in *Id.* 1. In the lament for Daphnis performed by the shepherd Thyrsis, the dying hero confronts Aphrodite. Offering a defiant catalogue of mortals who have bested her, he begins with the "cowherd" Anchises (1.105–106) and then continues sarcastically (109–110):

ὥραϊος χῶδωνις, ἐπεὶ καὶ μῆλα νομεύει
καὶ πτόκας βάλλει καὶ θηρία πάντα διώκει·

ripe for love is Adonis; he herds his flocks and shoots hares and chases all
kinds of wild animals.

The figure of Adonis in *Id.* 1 is in fact of paramount importance for an understanding of *Id.* 15. The dying Daphnis first claims (1.104) that "even in Hades Daphnis will be a bitter sorrow to Love". He then cites three mortals who have caused Aphrodite grief: Anchises, Adonis, and Diomedes. Anchises' role in this catalogue is problematic. He represents either a mortal man who holds erotic power over Aphrodite, or, like Adonis, a beloved youth who dies after their liaison.⁴⁰ Diomedes

³⁸ There is equally no mention of his hunting, an activity linked to his herding activities in the passage from *Id.* 1 cited below.

³⁹ Compare [Theocr.] *Id.* 20.34–36, where Aphrodite's passion drives her to tend cattle.

⁴⁰ The various myths of Anchises are reviewed by Gow (1952) *ad* 1.106; in some

and Adonis are more straightforward. Diomedes, the epic warrior, is the opposite of Adonis. He wounds instead of being wounded; he lives instead of dying; he triumphs over Aphrodite and forces her to flee. Adonis, on the other hand, is in essence a double of Daphnis, a shepherd who dies tragically young in a mountain setting as a sacrifice for love.⁴¹ Just as Aphrodite tries to bring Adonis back from death (most notably in versions of the myth which pit her against Persephone for possession of Adonis),⁴² so, too, she tries to bring back Daphnis (*Id.* 1.138–140) but fails. In *Id.* 1, Aphrodite is thus bested four times by a mortal herdsman: by Daphnis, by Anchises, by Adonis, and finally by Thyrsis, the singer of the Daphnis song, who (in Alpers' terms) 'convenes' Daphnis for his audience. Where the goddess was powerless, the singer has succeeded—in both senses of the word, since Thyrsis is Daphnis' heir as shepherd-poet.

The correspondence between Daphnis and the Adonis of *Id.* 15 is even stronger than that between Daphnis and the Adonis of *Id.* 1. Both are pictured as reclining beneath Aphrodite, suspended between life and death, as the centerpiece of a song. Once dead, both are consigned to water (1.140–141; 15.133).⁴³ Both are celebrated by prize-winning singers who are noted for this very theme, the lament for the dying herdsman (compare 15.98 with 1.19–20, 24). The songs themselves are carefully equated to crafted objects, objects whose realism is praised by naive viewers in extended ecphrastic passages: the tapestries in *Id.* 15, the famous cup of *Id.* 1. Indeed, the last scene on the cup, cited by Alpers as "a representation of the pastoral art of Theocritus himself",⁴⁴

versions he is punished for boasting of his conquest (Hygin. 94; Virg. *Aen.* 2.649) by either death or mutilation.

⁴¹ Halperin (1983a) 99–114 shows important parallels between Theocritus' Daphnis and the Near Eastern Tammuz, whose cult is frequently seen as the model for Adonis-cult; see Burkert (1985) 177.

⁴² [Apollod.] 3.183–185; cf. Bion's *Epitaph for Adonis* 54, 96).

⁴³ Gow (1952) *ad Id.* 1.140 discusses the meaning of the linked phrases ἔβα ῥόον, "he went to the stream", and ἔκλυσε δίνα ... τὸν Μοῖσαις φίλον ἄνδρα, "the current closed over the man beloved of the Muses", as descriptions of Daphnis' death. While it is possible that these phrases refer to Acheron, the river of the underworld is usually named and is normally traversed by boat. Gow notes the importance of nymphs in *Id.* 1 and raises the possibility that we are to take these phrases as referring to actual bodies of water. Pursuing this line of interpretation, Zimmerman (1994) 68 views the Daphnis-song through the figure of Narcissus and argues that Daphnis literally melts as he dies. I think this may be reading too much into these phrases; however, the analogy with the Adonis myth may well have influenced Theocritus' image of Daphnis' death.

⁴⁴ Alpers (1996) 149.

depicts a boy plaiting a cricket-cage out of rushes (1.45–54); the activity of weaving, long a traditional metaphor for poetic composition, is balanced between the male world of outdoor work (the fisherman on the cup, the herdsmen, the boy's own assigned task of guarding the vines) and the female world of child-rearing and textile production. In both *Id.* 1 and 15, then, the triangulation *ekphrasis*-song-dying herdsman reinforces the possibilities of 'convening': pastoral performance, like the deceptively lifelike scenes on cup and wall-hanging, can reanimate and resurrect lost pastoral heroes such as Daphnis and Adonis so that they seem to be "alive, not woven" (15.83).

The song for the dying herdsman, featured so prominently in *Id.* 1 and 15, reappears in another programmatic poem, *Id.* 7. The goatherd Lycidas falls in with the urban narrator Simichidas, who is making his way to a festival of Demeter. The two exchange songs, and in Lycidas' *propemptikon* for his beloved Ageanax he pictures himself after the boy's departure not as a goatherd, but as an urban symposiast. He will recline on a couch (7.66–67), wear garlands (7.63–64), drink wine (69–70), and hear "bucolic" musicians (7.71–73):

αὐλησεῦντι δέ μοι δύο ποιμένες, εἷς μὲν Ἀχαρνεύς,
εἷς δὲ Λυκωπίτας· ὁ δὲ Τίτυρος ἐγγύθεν ἄσει
ὧς ποκα τὰς Ξενέας ἡράσσατο Δάφνης ὁ βούτας, κτλ.

two shepherds shall pipe for me, one from Acharnae, one from Lycope, and Tityrus, nearby, shall sing how once Daphnis the cowherd loved Xenea, etc.

Tityrus' song goes on to describe Daphnis' death scene, with nature mourning around him, and then presents a second dying herdsman, the imprisoned goatherd Comatas (7.78–89). But Comatas, unlike Daphnis, is rescued: bees feed him in the chest where he is confined. Lycidas closes his song with an acknowledgment of the distance between his own world and the legendary worlds of Daphnis and Comatas (7.86–89), a distance already signaled by the intermediary figure of the performer Tityrus:

αἴθ' ἐπ' ἐμεῦ ζωοῖς ἐναρίθμιος ὄφελος ἦμεν,
ὥς τοι ἐγὼν ἐνόμειον ἀν' ὥρεα τὰς καλὰς αἶγας
φωνᾶς εἰσαῖων, τὸ δ' ὑπὸ δρυσὶν ἢ ὑπὸ πεύκαις
ἀδὺν μελιδοόμενος κατεκέκλισο, θεῖε Κομᾶτα.

if only you had been among the living in my time, so that I could have herded your fair goats in the mountains, listening to your voice, while you beneath oaks or pines would lie sweetly playing, divine Comatas.

The multiple layers of artifice here are bewildering. Lycidas is a ‘real’ goatherd in the world of the narrator; he wears a pungent goat-skin and carries a gnarled club (7.15–19), and the narrator introduces him with the provocative comment, “no one could fail to recognize him, since he was just like a goatherd” (7.13–14).⁴⁵ In his own song, Lycidas is transformed into an urban banqueter who hears ‘real’ shepherds piping and singing. The subject of this doubly-inset song is two legendary herdsmen, and Lycidas suddenly reverts to his goatherding persona and opposes the reality of his existence in the modern world to an impossible communion with the heroic goatherd-poet Comatas. In that nostalgic vision, the functions of herding and poetry are separated: Lycidas acts as herdsman to free Comatas for poetry. Simichidas, in the meantime, although clearly a member of the urban elite, metaphorically claims that he was “herding” (βουκολέοντα, 7.92) in the mountains when composing poetry.⁴⁶ Real, metaphorical and legendary herdsmen are jumbled together in a self-conscious series of infinitely reflected pastoral mirrors: urban poet meets goatherd, goatherd figures himself as urban symposiast, symposiast listens to shepherds hymn the legendary Daphnis and Comatas, and Comatas, in the farthest remove from reality, hands over his flocks to Lycidas and monopolizes the function of singing—whereupon the urban poet Simichidas proceeds to make his own claim to the discarded flock. Who is a shepherd, asks *Id.* 7? Everyone and no one.

The same preoccupation with different levels of reality appears, in a different form, in *Id.* 15. We have already seen how the shepherd Tityrus who sings at Lycidas’ banquet performs a ‘distancing’ function, making Lycidas more urban and the subjects of the song (Daphnis and Comatas) more remote and legendary. And we have noted the presence of similar ‘real’ shepherds in the Adonis song, timely reminders of Adonis’ own pastoral nature. They, like Tityrus in *Id.* 7, are part of a jumbled conglomeration of the everyday and the mythic. Their role in the description of the tableau bears closer scrutiny.

⁴⁵ The identity of Lycidas and the extent to which Simichidas represents Theocritus have been debated endlessly. For a good recent summary with further references, see Hubbard (1998) 22–26.

⁴⁶ Simichidas makes it clear at the beginning of the poem that he is from the city (7.2). On the metaphorical force of 7.92 see Gutzwiller (1991) 158; Hubbard (1998) 26–27 accuses Simichidas of trying to outdo Lycidas by posing as a neatherd (superior socially to the goatherd).

The singer's description of the reclining Adonis begins with the royal patron of the festival, Arsinoe (15.110–111), who in gratitude for Aphrodite's deification of her mother Berenice is said to spoil Adonis (ἀτιτάλλει, 15.111) with every good thing imaginable. Proof follows in the form of a list of offerings: fruits (112), gardens in silver baskets (113–114),⁴⁷ cakes made by γυναῖκες—that is, by worshippers like Gorgo and Praxinoa (115–116). At this point the list takes an odd turn: “all creatures winged and crawling are present” (πάντ' αὐτῷ πετεηνὰ καὶ ἔρπετὰ τεῖδε πάρεστι, 15.118).

Commentators disagree about these “winged and crawling” things; some argue that the creatures are in fact meat offerings, others that they are the cakes, in animal and bird shapes.⁴⁸ In other words, the commentators see the “creatures” as continuations of the food offerings preceding l. 118. But as the list continues, the “creatures” are immediately followed by bowers (shading the couch with Adonis' effigy), and the bowers, in turn, are topped with flying Erotes, who are compared to nightingales in an extended simile (15.119–122). In conjunction with the shading branches and the mobile Erotes flitting overhead, the peculiar phrasing of this line therefore tempts the listener to imagine the creatures not as edible offerings, but as part of the backdrop, like the canopy of dill and the winged Cupids.⁴⁹ I would argue, in other words, that the singer's description becomes deliberately ambiguous; she begins to ‘convene’ Adonis, to bring the tableau to life.

In the next few lines, the same ambiguity is maintained. The emphasis on materials (ebony, gold and ivory, 15.123)⁵⁰ retreats from the fluttering Erotes and focuses attention again on an inanimate object (the couch), an object designed for rest (sleep or death), but which para-

⁴⁷ The ephemeral potted gardens are traditional features of the Adonis festival; see Burkert (1985) 177 and Gow (1952) *ad Id.* 15.113 for ancient sources.

⁴⁸ Meat: Gow (1952) *ad Id.* 15.118; *contra* Burton (1995) 141 with further references.

⁴⁹ In Bion's later *Epitaph for Adonis*, all nature mourns for Adonis (ll. 32–38), as do the Erotes (ll. 79–86) hovering above his purple-draped couch—an obvious reminiscence of *Id.* 15. If the Erotes of *Id.* 15 are floating above the couch of the still-living Adonis, then it would not be surprising to find here an allusion to the animals who mourn Daphnis in *Id.* 1 (1.71–75) and who will mourn Adonis and Bion in later Greek bucolic. Note that the adjectives specifically describe the creatures as moving (creeping and flying). The same phrase appears in Herodotus (1.140), where it refers to living creatures killed indiscriminately by the Magi.

⁵⁰ On the Ptolemaic practice of using luxury materials in such public displays see Weber (1993) 329–330.

doxically depicts movement (the eagles carrying off Ganymede, 15.124). This emphasis on materiality continues in the description of the purple-dyed coverlets, πορφύρεοι δὲ τάπητες (15.125). With the introduction of the talking shepherds in l. 126, however, the singer again moves from lifeless artifact to breathing, speaking creatures. The half-living, half-dead Adonis is thus appropriately placed in a setting that hovers between artificial tableau and fully realized mythic narrative.

The culmination of this double-tiered description is the figure of Adonis himself. We hear no more about cloth or metal or baked goods. “Rosy-armed” Adonis embraces Aphrodite (15.128); the epithet feminizes him but also marks him as a mythic character who can move and act in a narrative, no longer an effigy in a tableau. Finally, in our last glimpse of him, he has come fully alive: there is fine hair on Adonis’ face, and his gentle kisses can be felt (οὐ κεντεῖ τὸ φίλημα· ἔτι οἱ περὶ χεῖλεα πυρρὰ, “his kisses do not sting; tawny fuzz still covers his lips”, 15.130). At that precise moment, the singer’s *ekphrasis* is completed, and she abandons the tableau: “Let us say farewell to Cypris as she embraces her beloved” (15.131). The focus of her song shifts to the future, to the lament the women will sing as they carry Adonis to the sea, introduced by a phrase which implies that a quoted song follows: λιγυρᾶς ἀρξέμεθ’ αἰοιδᾶς, “we will begin our clear-toned song” (15.135). The subsequent praise of Adonis as one who dies and returns thus performs a double function: a conclusion to the hymn in the palace, but also, like Tityrus’ song in *Id.* 7, a song-within-a-song, a prediction and recollection of the annually recurring lament which ends the Adonis-festival.⁵¹

Like *Id.* 7, then, *Id.* 15 contains an elaborate set of nested worlds: Gorgo and Praxinoa’s city, the palace at the heart of the city, the tableau and song inside the palace, the union of Aphrodite and Adonis inside the song, and, beyond that, the future world of tomorrow’s funeral. In that final, potential space of the funeral, women from the outermost world—the city—merge with the mythic Aphrodite as mourners of Adonis, a temporary and bittersweet experience of immortality which mirrors Aphrodite’s more permanent transformation of Berenice into a goddess (15.106–108). And it is precisely about immortality and mortality that the mourners will sing: Agamemnon, Ajax,

⁵¹ Marco Fantuzzi points out that the ending of *Id.* 7 (ll. 155–157) offers the same sort of ambiguous quotation: the poet’s *envoi* to the nymphs and Demeter can be read either as a conclusion to the poem, or as a farewell prayer spoken at the festival.

Hector and the other epic heroes cannot return from the world of the dead (15.137–142). Only Adonis lives and dies year after year: ἔρπεις, ὦ φίλ' Ἀδωνι, καὶ ἐνθάδε κῆς Ἀχέροντα / ἡμιθέων ... μονώτατος, “you come and go, dear Adonis, both here and in Acheron, you alone of the demigods” (15.136–137).⁵²

Let us now return to Alpers' definition. Since he focuses on characters rather than setting, the urban backdrop of *Id.* 15 will not exclude it from pastoral. But is *Id.* 15 concerned with “herdsmen and their lives”? I will concede that it is not. I would argue, however, that it is very much concerned with herdsmen and their *deaths*. In the triple triumph of art (tapestry, tableau, and song) that restores Adonis temporarily to life, we find the same constellation of themes featured prominently in *Id.* 1 and 7: the loss of a young shepherd, countered by the ability of the artist to ‘convene’ the absent herdsman. We find, too, an awareness of the shifting ground of mimesis: realism implies its opposite, artifice. In *Id.* 7 and 15, in particular, ‘reality’ is continually receding as the poems take us deeper and deeper into the constructed worlds of song. In a limited sense, therefore, *Id.* 15 satisfies Alpers' criteria for pastoral. It contains a herdsman as a central figure; it celebrates the power of song to unite the past and the present; it assembles a naive fictional audience who model for Theocritus' readers the proper response to the imagined world of art and poetry.

3b. *Symmetry*

At the heart of the idylls most commonly seen as “bucolic” is the notion of exchange of song. Whether the exchange is song for cup (*Id.* 1), song for song (*Id.* 6, 7, 10), or the more formal singing contest (*Id.* 5), the central assumption remains the same: song is reciprocal, symmetrical. Halperin calls amoebean song (formal responsive singing in matched pairs of stanzas) “a hallmark of the bucolic poetry of Theocritus and his imitators”.⁵³ Rosenmeyer goes further. He considers symmetry an essential prerequisite to achieving pastoral *otium* and sees the formal singing contests as only one instantiation of a larger generic program: “the matching of perceptive beings in a nexus of friendship

⁵² Note that ἔρπεις echoes ἔρπετά in l. 118, reinforcing my suspicion that the contrast of animate/inanimate is central to that passage.

⁵³ Halperin (1983a) 178.

and equality”.⁵⁴ Gutzwiller regards symmetry as the logical corollary to the analogic structure she identifies as the founding principle of pastoral.⁵⁵

Can we find this symmetry, this responsive singing, in *Id.* 15? In a larger sense, I have already argued that the Adonis-song is equated to the tapestries and tableau in the palace; like the Daphnis-song of *Id.* 1 it is ‘traded’ for works of visual art. I would also claim, however, that Praxinoa engages at times in a form of amoebean competition both with Gorgo and with strangers she encounters en route to the festival.⁵⁶ Her linguistic game, a female version of the herdsmen’s singing contest, involves not matched pairs or quatrains, but proverbs and aphorisms.

Consider this exchange, which immediately follows Gorgo’s invitation to Praxinoa to attend the festival at the palace (15.24–26):

ΠΡ. ἐν ὀλβίῳ ὀλβια πάντα.

ΓΟ. ὦν ἴδες, ὦν εἴπαις κεν ἰδοῖσα τὸ τῷ μὴ ἰδόντι.
ἐρπεν ὥρα κ’ εἴη. ΠΡ. ἀεργοῖς αἰὲν ἑορτά.

(Praxinoa) The rich get richer. (Gorgo) See first, talk later—when you’ve been there and done that. It’s time to get moving. (Pr.) Every day’s a holiday for idlers.⁵⁷

Praxinoa responds to the invitation with the first gnomic statement: “everything’s fine in fine houses”. Gorgo caps her with a two-pronged aphorism of her own: “what you’ve seen, you can talk of, once you’ve seen it and someone else hasn’t”. Praxinoa quickly switches themes and wins the contest with “every day’s a holiday for idlers”.

A more hostile exchange occurs when a male stranger, overhearing Gorgo and Praxinoa’s admiring description of the tapestries, asks the women irritably to be quiet and pointedly criticizes their pronunciation, calling them *πλατειάσδοισαι ἅπαντα*, “women who broaden all [their vowels]” (15.88). Praxinoa’s blistering reply is studded with proverbs and alliterative gnomic statements: *πασάμενος ἐπίτασσε*, “where you are master, there give your orders” (15.90); *δωρίσδεν δ’ ἔξεστι, δοκῶ, τοῖς*

⁵⁴ Rosenmeyer (1969) 157.

⁵⁵ Gutzwiller (1991) 14.

⁵⁶ Whitehorne (1995) argues persuasively that all the exchanges between Gorgo and Praxinoa, including their mutual complaints about their husbands, are thinly disguised forms of competitive boasting.

⁵⁷ My translation here and in some of the other aphoristic passages below is not literal, but is intended to reproduce the repetitions, alliteration, and symmetrical structure of the Greek using familiar English phrases.

Δωριέεσσι, “Dorians, I deem, can speak Doric” (15.93); μή μοι κενεὸν ἀπομάξῃς, “don’t level an empty pot for me” (15.95).⁵⁸

This self-conscious allusion to Theocritus’ own choice of dialect has drawn considerable attention from critics.⁵⁹ For one thing, the man apparently speaks in Doric himself (if we can trust the manuscripts), thus undermining his own complaint. For another, Praxinoa gives an oddly erudite justification for her accent, tracing her Syracusan lineage—and that of the Syracusan poet Theocritus—back to Bellerophon (15.91–92).

What critics have not noticed is that just before this exchange the poem offers us another, similar episode where the characters discuss their own speech. This is at 15.60–64, where Gorgo and Praxinoa encounter an old woman and ask her how difficult it was to get into the palace. She responds, “by trying, the Greeks entered Troy, my pretty children. Try, and you shall succeed”. Gorgo immediately observes: χρησιμῶς ἃ πρεσβυτίς ἀπώχετο θεοσίξασα, “off goes the old woman, having intoned her oracles” (15.63)—to which Praxinoa replies with an oracle of her own: πάντα γυναῖκες ἴσαντι, καὶ ὥς Ζεὺς ἀγάγεθ’ Ἡρᾶν, “women know everything, even how Zeus married Hera” (15.64).⁶⁰ Just as the later passage questions and then defends Theocritus’ artificial Doric as proper speech for Syracusans, so this passage questions and then defends the exchange of proverbs as proper speech for women.⁶¹

⁵⁸ The last translation from Gow (1952) *ad* 15.95, with further discussion. The sense seems to be, “don’t waste time leveling off an empty measuring pot”, but there is some uncertainty about the force of her reference.

⁵⁹ See Gow (1952) *ad* 15.88, Horstmann (1976) 36–38, Zanker (1987) 164 and the extended discussion in Hunter (1996) 119–123. The most recent references are collected by Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 372–373.

⁶⁰ A tantalizingly suggestive reference to the incestuous Ptolemaic marriages; see Burton (1995) 39, 149–150.

⁶¹ On the large number of proverbs in the poem, see e.g. Horstmann (1976) 25–26; Burton (1995) 60. Zanker (1987) 158–159 points out the strong association of proverbs with Herodean mime, but also notes (168) that Theocritus uses proverbs heavily in some of the rustic idylls, notably *Id.* 5, whose herdsmen are located on the bottom of the social ladder. The association of proverbs with naive, uneducated characters is already found in Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1395a), who comments disparagingly that rustics are especially prone to coining maxims. I take partial exception to the most recent discussion of this issue by Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 160–161. He suggests that proverbs are “wholly naturalised” in the speech of rustic characters, but are often set off by distancing expressions (“as it is said”) in the urban mimes. While this is true of *Id.* 14, it is not true of 15. As acknowledged by Fantuzzi *ibidem* n. 116, the only potential example of such distancing in *Id.* 15 is l. 77, “ἔνδοι πάσαι”, ὁ τὰν νυθὸν εἶπ’ ἀποκλάξας, “‘All inside’, as the man said, locking in his bride”). But here the speech-act

In this light, Gorgo's reaction to the Adonis-song can be read as a celebration of female gnomic speech (15.145–146):

Πραξινοά, τὸ χρῆμα σοφώτατον ἅ θήλεια·
ὀλβία ὅσσα ἴσατι, πανολβία ὥς γλυκὺ φωνεῖ.

Praxinoa, what a clever thing [the] woman is! Blessed to be so wise, twice blessed to sing so sweetly.

I translate [the] woman, because while the Greek in the strictest sense refers to the singer (ἅ θήλεια = “that female one”), the curious wording also suggests taking “female” more broadly, as a reference to an abstract gender.⁶² In the latter sense, it is yet one more gnomic statement, and the symmetrical, aphoristic line which follows proves Gorgo's point: women—even ordinary women like Gorgo and Praxinoa—have their own form of *Kunstsprache*, their own equivalent to the songs and contests of the shepherds.

Id. 15 thus presents two possible examples of pastoral symmetry: the juxtaposition of song and tableau, paralleling the cup and song of *Id.* 1, and the exchanges of proverbs, paralleling the competition in *Id.* 5. Neither example is fully realized. The song, as we have seen, merges with the tableau as it describes it, and art and song cannot then form a neat diptych, as they do in *Id.* 1. Similarly, the aphoristic ‘contests’ are never formally distinguished as such, and in a certain sense play the role of ‘not-poetry’, serving as a foil to the elevated diction in the hymn. Still, both examples function at least in part in the way we would expect. The aphorisms, like the singing contests, reveal a community of equals that has accepted formal exchange as a mode of speaking. The Adonis-hymn, meanwhile, is performed in return for the work of skilled female weavers and bakers, just as the song of Thyrsis is performed in return for the work of the woodcarver.

is what makes the (somewhat vulgar) phrase effective; compare the very similar British expression, “Let’s be off, as the bride said to the nightie”. Perhaps the line dividing the naive from the self-conscious users of proverbs in the idylls is not between rustic and urban characters but between urban males, like the protagonists of *Id.* 14, and their less-educated female or rustic counterparts.

⁶² See Gow (1952) *ad* 15.145; Burton (1995) 119–120; while the meaning “females”, “the female gender” would require the neuter form of the adjective, as Dover (1971) points out *ad loc.*, the unparalleled wording here and the echo of the earlier phrase σοφόν τι χρῆμα ἄνθρωπος (15.83) create an effect like that of a transferred epithet: the neuter phrase “what a clever thing” pulls the oddly-chosen adjective “female” towards gender and away from the specific female singer.

3c. *Retreat and simplicity*

While Alpers chooses to focus on the figure of the herdsman, many critics have argued that the relationship of the pastoral world to the world of the audience is the crucial element. The pastoral world is repressively safe, a place where nature is unnaturally benign and the only human sorrows are erotic. It stands in implicit or explicit contrast to the world of the reader, a world filled with modern urban anxieties. Poggioli's *The Oaten Flute* contains the broadest version of this claim: "the psychological root of the pastoral is a double longing after innocence and happiness, to be recovered not through conversion or regeneration but merely through a retreat".⁶³ Poggioli thus takes Empson's view that pastoral puts "the complex into the simple" (for Empson, essentially a social transformation mediating class differences) and reconfigures it as a spatial transformation, a move from the complex backdrop of the city to a simple backdrop—typically, but not necessarily, rural. For while others have connected the notion of retreat with a particular type of natural setting, Poggioli is prepared to include modern, urban havens (such as Virginia Woolf's "room of one's own"), arguing that "pastoral poetry appears whenever the hustle and bustle of metropolitan life grows hard to bear and man tries to evade its pressures at least in thought".⁶⁴

By Poggioli's criteria, *Id.* 15 certainly presents a "retreat". Gorgo and Praxinoa begin the poem in Praxinoa's home, a chaotic space containing a wailing baby (15.41), a dog and cat (15.28, 43), and a servant who leaves work lying about and spills water (15.27–28, 30–31). In this sort of space, beautiful things must be kept hidden away (Praxinoa's gown, unearthed from a locked chest at 15.33), because the house is disorganized and vulnerable. Praxinoa's last comment on her home is a command to her slave to call in the dog and lock the door (15.43).

The next scene, the street, is even more chaotic. Praxinoa immediately calls attention to the crowd (ὃ θεοί, ὅσος ὄχλος, 15.44—the word ὄχλος is repeated again at 15.59 and 72, varied by ὄμιλος at 15.65) and expresses anxiety about street crime. Her praises of Ptolemy for policing the city (15.46–50) are then immediately undermined when his cavalry troops appear and the horses terrify her (15.51–55). The encounter

⁶³ Poggioli (1975) 1.

⁶⁴ Poggioli (1975) 3, 33.

with the mysterious old woman, described above, provides a temporary moment of relief for the harried reader, but the crowds and shoving (15.73, 76) reappear with redoubled intensity as the women reach the palace doors, and Praxinoa's shawl is torn in the struggle (15.69)—a significant loss in a poem whose first forty lines return again and again to the process of manufacturing cloth. Just as the change of scene from house to street was marked by the word ἀπόκλᾶξον (15.43, Praxinoa's command to her slave to lock the door behind her), so the transition into the palace is marked by the same word, in Praxinoa's aphoristic comment: “ἐνδοὶ πᾶσαι”, ὁ τὰν νυὸν εἶπ' ἀποκλᾶξας, “‘All inside’, as the man said, locking in his bride”, 15.77).

The palace, as we discover, is more successful in maintaining its boundaries than Praxinoa's house. The words for crowd all vanish; there is no more mention of pushing. Cloth in the palace does not need to be locked in a chest to protect it from being torn as Praxinoa's ἐμπερόναμα was at l. 34; the tapestries are out on display and their description as θεῶν περόνάματα, “garments for gods” (15.79), deliberately recalls Praxinoa's endangered handiwork.⁶⁵ Where the people on the street had been described as ἀνὰριθμοι καὶ ἄμετροι, “numberless and countless” (15.45), the only numerous items inside are the offerings for Adonis in the singer's hymn, characterized with various forms of the word “all” (πάντεσσι, 15.111, παντοῖα, 15.116, πάντ', 15.118). But the palace is not yet a true pastoral haven; Praxinoa's acrimonious exchange with the dialect-critic reveals that although the physical danger of the streets may be safely behind the two women, the social conflicts of Alexandria have come through the doors with the spectators.

Once the singer begins, however, it is possible to see something like Poggioli's “retreat” being evoked. We have already noted how elaborately Gorgo's call for silence separates the singer's speech from the rest of the dialogue in the poem. The hymnic description of the tableau requires this separation; like the locked doors marking off house from street and palace from city, an emphatic border must surround the tableau the singer brings to life. Here, finally, are the elements of the *locus amoenus* found in traditional pastoral landscapes: “tender” plants (ἀπαλοὶ κᾶποι, the delicate miniature Adonis-gardens in their silver baskets, 15.113, significantly modified by the adjective πεφυλαγμένοι, “guarded”), birds and beasts mingling around the lovers' couch,

⁶⁵ On the various clothing terms used in *Id.* 15 see Gow (1952) *ad* 15.21 and Whitehorne (1995).

shade overhead (15.119–120), a soft place to recline (the couch with its shepherd-supplied coverlets which are μαλακώτεροι ὕπνω, “softer than sleep” 15.125). The deictic expressions—πάρε, πάρεσσι, τεῖδε (15.112–113, 118)—are reminiscent of invitations to song in the bucolic idylls, which use emphatic repetitions of terms such as ὦδε (e.g. 3.38; 5.31–32, 44, 45–46) and τεῖδε (1.12; 5.50, 67) to entice the potential singer or contest judge. Compare in particular one of Lacon’s invitations in *Id.* 5: ἦ μὰν ἀρνακίδας τε καὶ εἴρια τεῖδε πατησεῖς, / αἶ κ’ ἔνθης, ὕπνω μαλακώτερα, “well, here, if you come, you shall walk on lambskins and fleeces softer than sleep” (5.50–51).

The closest parallel to the “retreat” described in the Adonis-hymn is, of course, the description of the harvest-festival at the end of *Id.* 7. The narrator and his urban companions recline on couches (7.132–134) with shade overhead (7.135–136, 138). Winged creatures flutter above them (7.139–142). A profusion of offerings surround them, notably sweet-smelling fruits (7.143–144, compare the fruit at 15.112 and the perfume at 15.114). Both poems even conclude in the same way, with prayers for the return of the deity who presides over the retreat (7.156–157, 15.149). Although the festival-goers of *Id.* 7 are outdoors in the countryside of Cos, and their couches are of rushes instead of ebony and gold, the emphasis in both descriptions is the same: bounty, fertility, repose.⁶⁶

The similarities between *Id.* 15 and 7 go beyond the retreats described at the end of each poem, however, and extend to the process by which the characters in the poem achieve their repose: in both poems, the celebrants must undergo an initiation process before they are admitted to the retreat. The initiation motif in *Id.* 7 has been studied extensively; it is primarily a literary initiation, and goes back to the scene in Hesiod’s *Theogony* (22–35), where the goddesses teach Hesiod song as he herds his flocks and give him a staff to mark his status as a poet.⁶⁷ A simplistic summary of the elements of this initiation might run as follows: Simichidas, the urban narrator, encounters the goatherd Lycidas, an established poet, en route to the festival. Lycidas greets the younger man with a mixture of mockery and courtesy—he is described as laughing at each stage of the encounter, 7.20, 42, 128

⁶⁶ Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 157 compares the two poems’ conclusions; he points out earlier in his discussion (p. 147) that the *locus amoenus* of the Thalsia is by far the most idealized landscape in Theocritus and notes the importance of the religious context.

⁶⁷ Kambylis (1965) traces the motif through classical literature; on initiation in *Id.* 7 see the references collected at Hubbard (1998) 23.

and patronizingly calls Simichidas ἔρνος, “sprig” (7.44), but also praises his poetic judgment. The two exchange songs; Lycidas gives Simichidas his staff as a symbol of their poetic friendship (7.129). Simichidas and his companions then arrive at the festival and enjoy the bounty they (or at least Simichidas) have earned through their journey and poetic labors.⁶⁸

The initiation sequence in *Id.* 15 is less overtly literary, and includes more stages of the ritual, but essentially follows the same pattern. The urban protagonists begin at Praxinoa’s home, where in preparation for the outing Praxinoa washes (15.28–32, note her comment at 15.32: οἷα θεοῖς ἐδόξει, τοιαῦτα νέμμαι, “I’m as clean as the gods have permitted”) and brings out a special garment from a locked chest (15.33).⁶⁹ The journey to the palace is chaotic and difficult, and Praxinoa in particular is frequently alarmed (her first words as she leaves the house are “O, Gods!”, 15.44); the women are pushed (15.52, 73), mocked (15.87–88), and Praxinoa’s clothing is torn (15.69–70). (Here the analogies to the Eleusis procession are striking; the initiates were part of a large crowd, were mocked, and may even have worn torn clothing).⁷⁰ Before they can be admitted they encounter a mysterious old woman (15.60–64) who addresses them as children (κάλλιστα παίδων, 15.62: compare Lycidas’ “sprig”, 7.44) and gives oracular advice about entering the festival precinct. Finally, once they are inside, there is Gorgo’s call for ritual silence preceding the singer’s performance, already discussed earlier (15.96–99).

It is true that the elements of ritual initiation in *Id.* 15 are treated comically. The maid spills the wash water, Gorgo resents the oracular old woman, and Praxinoa gives the mocker as good as she gets—unlike the Eleusinian victims, who are required to remain silent. These comic elements, however, only serve to set off the hymn more completely from the world of everyday Alexandria. The animated tableau offers an attractive refuge precisely because we have followed Gorgo and Praxi-

⁶⁸ Lycidas is a mysterious figure; he has sometimes been identified as a divinity and his appearance is marked by elements of epiphany (notably his enigmatic smile, 7.19–20; compare the smiling Aphrodite of *Id.* 1.95). See Hubbard (1998) 24; Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 155 with further references.

⁶⁹ The removal of a fine gown from a chest inevitably recalls *Iliad* 6.280–295, where Hecuba takes the “lowest” (most protected) gown from her stores to offer to the goddess Athena.

⁷⁰ Mylonas (1961) 62–63; Herodas 8.65 and Aristoph. *Ran.* 404–413, on which see Dover (1993) 62–63; more generally on mockery and initiation in this passage Burton (1995) 200 n. 51.

noa step by breathless step through the initiation process—their struggle through the city streets. The contrast between urban complexity and pastoral retreat is not merely implied in *Id.* 15, it is enacted for us and by us.

4. *Conclusions*

In the end, I am not so foolish as to propose that *Id.* 15 is a fully pastoral poem—if such a thing even exists in Theocritus.⁷¹ And it is certainly not a bucolic poem, as that term is normally understood. What I am prepared to argue is that *Id.* 15 contains a significant cluster of pastoral traits. It invokes the pastoral program of resurrecting the dying herdsman; it offers symmetrical exchanges of speech and song; it invites its protagonists—and its readers—into an elaborately described retreat. Moreover, *Id.* 15 repeatedly presents its readers with striking parallels in theme, structure, and wording to *Id.* 1 and 7, long accepted as seminal texts for the later development of pastoral.

As my final and most speculative venture, then, I would like to propose a new programmatic trinity for pastoral poetics: *Id.* 1, 7, and 15. *Id.* 1 offers us the closest thing to a completely enclosed pastoral retreat. Every character is a herdsman; every story has a rustic setting. The scenes on the cup contain hints of another world—the laboring fisherman, the suitors—but since the cup comes from a liminal figure, a ferryman (1.57), this is somewhat appropriate, and by the end of the poem the cup has been consecrated to the pastoral world: it is paid for with a goat and a cheese instead of money (1.57–58), and it is used for milk rather than wine (1.143–144). *Id.* 7, by contrast, offers a pastoral world that is semi-permeable. Characters can ‘slip’ from herdsman to urban poet and back again; real poets are named alongside legendary shepherds as models for Lycidas and Simichidas. The setting, however, remains consistently rustic, and nature behaves in approved, pastoral fashion, offering only bounty and repose. *Id.* 15 completes the trio by showing us the pastoral world as an artifact inside the very Alexandrian

⁷¹ *Id.* 15 is not the only poem subject to this ‘pastoralizing’ analysis; critics have long recognized pastoral elements in *Id.* 2 (see e.g. Van Sickle (1976) 24; Stanzel (1996) 217–222) and *Id.* 14 takes place largely in the country and involves unrequited love (see, e.g., Pretagostini, this volume, pp. 67–70); see above, notes 2 and 31 for recent arguments against segregating Theocritean poems on the basis of “bucolic” qualities.

city which made its creation necessary. The struggle to reach that royal garden at the center of the city is, like the women's weaving, a metaphor for Theocritus' own career—a struggle the poet depicts more explicitly in *Id.* 16 and 17. By emphatically (and comically) evoking the contrast between 'real' city and 'ideal' retreat, Theocritus invites us to see pastoral in its full context, as the product of an urban court, and to see the pastoral poet in *his* full context, as a resident of Alexandria.⁷²

⁷² This essay is dedicated to the memory of E. David Francis, who introduced me to Theocritus.

EPIGRAM AT THE MARGINS OF PASTORAL

ALEXANDER SENS

No more than a few generations after the first extant bucolic poetry was composed, an epitaph from Egypt called attention to the learning expected of its ideal reader:¹

Εἰ καὶ βουκόλοι ἄνδρες ὁδὸν διαμείβετε τήνδε,
καὶ ποιμένας οἶων φέρεβετε μηλονόμοι,
ἀλλὰ σὺ, Μουσείοις καμ[άτο]ις τετραμμέν' ὁδίτα,
ἴσχε καὶ αὐδήσας σῆμ' Ἀλίνης ἄπιθι,
χαῖρε εἰπὼν δις [δ' α]ὐτὸς ἔχοις τόδε· τέκνα δὲ λείπω
τρῖζυγα καὶ ποθέοντ' ἄνδρα λέλοιπα δόμοις.

Although you cowherds travel this road, and you shepherds pasture your flocks of sheep, nonetheless you, passerby, raised through toiling in the Muses, stop and, after saying “this is the tomb of Aline”, go your way. Bid me “farewell”, and fare twice so well. I leave at home a brace of children, and a husband who yearns for me.

The original location of this carefully composed inscription is now unknown, but the poem itself presupposes that it was set up in an isolated, rural place frequented by the cowherds and shepherds to whom it is initially addressed. Indeed, the point of the opening lines depends on the epitaph’s explicit recognition of an apparent contradiction between the professions of those who frequent the locale, on the one hand, and the learning expected of its intended readers, on the other. At the same time, however, the use of the second person in the opening apostrophe to βουκόλοι and μηλονόμοι, who are thus imagined as being able to read the inscription, implies that in the view of the speaker at least some of the poem’s readers will be herdsmen, with the result that the epigram blurs the distinction between the educated traveler “raised in the toils of the Muses” and those shepherds and cowherds who use the road regularly. In emphasizing the learning required of its intended reader, the epitaph offers a nice piece of evidence that some of the values of the “birdcage of the Muses” that was the Alexandrian Museum tran-

¹ *IMEGR* 34 = *GVI* 1312. The date of the poem has been variously assigned to the late 3rd (so Bing (1998) or 2nd century (cf. Bernand *ad loc.*).

scended its bounds.² Whether the person who composed the epitaph for Aline really believed that herdsmen might be able to read the opening couplet is unknowable, but the author of the epigram presupposes, or at least pretends that few if any would in fact have been able to do so. Thus the address to passing βουκόλοι and μηλονόμοι is a conceit whose origins lie less in life than in art,³ and indeed the world envisioned in the epitaph seems to owe something to what is a fundamental assumption of the bucolic tradition, namely the fiction of an idyllic rural landscape populated by herdsmen well trained in poetry.

One strand of this tradition is obviously to be found in the bucolic poems of Theocritus. But in opening with an address to herdsmen, the composer of the Aline epitaph may also have been influenced by another early Hellenistic poetic form, literary epigrams in which herdsmen and the natural world in which they live play a prominent part. Indeed, the flowering, early in the 3rd century, of epigrams destined for performance or for the written page rather than any actual monument ranks as one of the most interesting and important developments in the literary history of the Hellenistic period. Poets expanded the traditional boundaries of epigram in a variety of ways, incorporating into a form originally designed to mark graves and dedications material from a number of other literary traditions, including both archaic and classical poetry, but also the work of near contemporary writers. It is thus not surprising that already in the 3rd century we find a number of epigrams that incorporate motifs that also appear in Theocritus' poetry. Some of these poems explicitly mention herdsmen (including figures with overtly pastoral names like Daphnis and Thyrsis) or rustic divinities like Pan, Hermes (as protector of crops and the like; e.g. Hermocreon, *APlan.* 11 = *HE* 1943f.), and the Nymphs and objects like the *syrinx* that were closely associated with them.⁴ Others invite

² For the literary values of the inscription, cf. Bing (1998).

³ For the address to passing herdsmen, cf. Leonidas *AP* 7.657.1–4 = *HE* 2062–2065: Ποιμένες οἱ ταύτην ὄρεος ῥάχιν οἰοπολεῖτε / αἶγας κεῖνείρους ἐμβοτέοντες οἷς, / Κλειταγόρη, πρὸς Γῆς, δλίγην χάριν, ἀλλὰ προσηνῇ / τίνετε χθονίης εἵνεκα Φερσεφόνης, “Shepherds who travel alone on this mountain ridge pasturing your goats and wooly sheep, may you grant to Clitagoras, by Earth, a small but gentle favor for chthonic Persephone’s sake”.

⁴ Epigrams of this sort include [Plato], *AP* 9.823 = *FGE* 630ff., *APlan.* 13 = 636ff.; Anyte, *APlan.* 231 = *HE* 738ff., 291 = 672ff.; Theocritus, *AP* 6.336 = *HE* 3392ff., 177 = 3398ff., 9.338 = 3468ff., 432 = 3498ff., 433 = 3492ff., 437 = 3474ff.; Leonidas, *AP* 6.262 = *HE* 2261ff., 263 = 2265ff., 334 = 1966ff., 9.318 = 2470ff., 326 = 1978ff., 744 = 2478ff., *APlan.* 190 = 2474ff., 230 = 2498ff.; Mnasalcas, *AP* 9.324 = *HE* 2663ff.;

passersby to enter and enjoy stylized *loca amoena* of a sort familiar from Theocritean pastoral;⁵ despite the fact that idealized representations of the countryside have a long history in Greek literature, it seems hard to believe—given the prominence of such invitations in Theocritean bucolic (e.g. Theocr. 1.21–23; 5.45–59)—that Hellenistic poets would have distinguished sharply between these epigrams and those containing more specifically pastoral terminology.⁶ The precise relationship between Theocritus' poetry and the earliest examples of epigrams that paint an idealized picture of the rural landscape is now obscure, not least because of problems of chronology—to which we will return—but it does seem clear that already early in the 3rd-cent. epigram could serve as a canvas on which poets played with and commented self-reflexively on the generic conventions of pastoral poetry.

Let us begin with Leonidas, *APlan.* 230 = *HE* 2498ff., whose speaker advises passersby not to drink the warm, muddy water nearby, but to continue on just a short distance further until they find the cool, babbling brook under the shade of a pine tree:

Μὴ σὺ γ' ἐπ' οἰονόμοιο περίπλεον ἱλύος ὤδε
 τοῦτο χαραδραίης θερμόν, ὀδίτα, πίης·
 ἀλλὰ μολὼν μάλα τυτθὸν ὑπὲρ δαμαλήβοτον ἄκρη
 κεῖσέ γε πὰρ κείνα ποιμενία πίτυι
 εὐρήσεις κελαρῦζον ἐνκρήνου διὰ πέτρης
 νᾶμα βορειαίης ψυχρότερον νιφάδος.

Traveler, don't drink this hot water full of torrential mud here in this sheep pasture, but going just a bit more above the headland where the heifers graze, there you will find under that shepherd's pine a beautiful stream babbling through the rock, colder than the snow of Boreas.

The spring to which the speaker directs passersby is depicted in the idealized and selective terms that are characteristic of literary *loca amoena*.⁷ Like the literary springs in pastoral poetry, it emanates invitingly from a rock in a shaded location, its water is cool and clear, its sound invit-

Callimachus, *AP* 7.518 = *HE* 1211ff.; Diotimus (or Leonidas), *AP* 7.173 = *HE* 1769ff.; Hermocreon, *AP* 9.327 = *HE* 1947ff.; Alcaeus, *APlan.* 226 = *HE* 128ff.; Meleager, *AP* 7.196 = *HE* 4066ff., 535 = 4700ff.; Glaucus, *AP* 9.341 = *HE* 1819ff.; Erycius, *AP* 6.96 = *GPh* 2200ff., 255 = 2224ff., 7.174 = 2238ff., 9.237 = 2206ff., 558 = 2212ff.; Zonas, *AP* 9.556 = *GPh* 3486ff.; Scaevola, *AP* 9.217 = *GPh* 3374ff.; Crinagoras, *AP* 7.636 = *GPh* 2030ff.; Myrinus *AP* 7.703 = *GPh* 2568ff.

⁵ E.g. Anyte, *AP* 313 = *HE* 726ff., *APlan.* 228 = 734ff.; Nicias, *AP* 9.315 = *HE* 2771ff.

⁶ The same is perhaps not true for epigrams that depict other aspects of rural life; for the distinction between "bucolic" and "rural" epigrams, cf. Rossi (2001) 29–57.

⁷ For the conventional features of the *locus amoenus*, cf. Schönbeck (1962) 15–60.

ing. We may compare, for example, the setting of Theocritus 1, verses that seem to advertise the themes and values of bucolic as a whole, and that similarly feature a mellifluous spring under a pine tree (ll. 1–3 Ἄδύ τι τὸ ψιθύρισμα καὶ ἅ πίτυς, αἰπόλε, τήνα, / ἅ ποτὶ ταῖς παγαῖσι, μελισσεται, ἄδὺ δὲ καὶ τὴ / συρίσδεις, “Sweet is the whispering of that pine by the springs, goatherd, and sweet too your piping”). So, too, the participle κελαρύζον finds a close parallel in another programmatic passage,⁸ the idealized description of the natural world at Theocr. 7.136–137 τὸ δ’ ἐγγύθεν ἱερὸν ὕδωρ / Νυμφᾶν ἐξ ἄντροιο κατειβόμενον κελάρυζε, “and nearby the sacred water babbles as it pours from the cave of the nymphs”.⁹ Indeed, the final four lines of the epigram may be understood as a sort of bucolic set piece that engages with and varies a motif common in early Hellenistic epigram: the invitation for a traveler to rest in the shade and to drink from a nearby spring. To cite just one example, Anyte, *APlan.* 228 = *HE* 734ff. urges passersby to rest, to enjoy the sound of the wind in the leaves, and to refresh themselves with cool spring water:¹⁰

Ξεῖν’, ὑπὸ τὰν πέτραν τετρουμένα γυῖ’ ἀνάπαυσον—
 ἄδύ τοι ἐν χλωροῖς πνεῦμα θροεῖ πετάλοις—
 πίδακά τ’ ἐκ παγᾶς ψυχρὸν πίε, δὴ γὰρ ὀδίταις
 ἄμπαυμ’ ἐν θερμῷ καύματι τοῦτο φίλον.

Stranger, rest your weary limbs beneath this rock—the wind makes a sweet sound in the green leaves—and drink cold water from the spring. For this is a pleasant respite to travelers in the burning heat.

What differentiates the final verses of Leonidas’ epigram from this and other epigrammatic *loca amoena* is that the poem presents itself as an inscription erected in proximity to a body of water whose qualities are strikingly at odds with those that characterize the springs of bucolic poetry. The fictional setting of the poem, though rural, thus lies conspicuously outside the idealized world of bucolic poetry, in which the *locus amoenus* exists as a self-standing unit, with no suggestion of the unattractive and unpleasant rural landscape that surrounds it. Whereas *loca amoena* traditionally emphasize the coolness, the clarity and the delicate sound of the springs, here we find warm, turbid water; although the opening couplet contains no explicit reference to sound, the close

⁸ Cf. Hunter (1999) 191–193.

⁹ Cf. Bernsdorff (2001) 146.

¹⁰ For the representation of nature in Anyte’s epigrams, cf. Elliger (1975) 377–381.

association of χαράδραι with loud and sometimes unpleasant noises¹¹ suggests that the phrase ἰλύος ... χαραδραΐης of the first couplet may be understood to stand in opposition to the κελαρύζον ... νᾶμα of the last two lines on this score as well. Thus the speaking voice describes an attractive location in terms familiar from Theocritean bucolic and from contemporary epigram, but does so as an outsider, as a resident of a very different sort of a rural location, one that is at once isolated (cf. below on οἰονόμοιο) and—unlike the bucolic countryside—wholly unappealing.

The poem thus may be understood as a comment on, and play with, literary form. We shall consider the question of Anyte's date below, but for now we may note only that whether or not one accepts the traditional view that she belonged to the first generation of Hellenistic poets, the final two couplets of Leonidas' epigram clearly assume and depend for their point on the existence of poems (like *APlan.* 228) in which the speaker's invitation for the passerby to drink is set entirely within an idealized bucolic world.¹² By placing the description of the *locus amoenus* in the "mouth" of a speaker whose own surroundings are anything but pleasant (at least if judged by the expectations established in contemporary poetry), the poem expands the boundaries of the bucolic world from which it pointedly stands at some remove, as the demonstratives ὧδε, τοῦτο, κεῖσε and κεῖνᾱ emphasize.¹³ The coexistence of two versions of the rural landscape within a single poem thus calls attention to the selectivity and artificiality of any description of the natural world, and in particular of conventional *loca amoena* such as are found in Theocritus and the authors of bucolic epigram. In such a context, the adjective ποιμένιος in verse 4 takes on special interest. Gow and Page (*HE* vol. 2, 386) express uncertainty about the word's precise meaning, but plausibly suggest, "*known to or frequented by shepherds*, as it would be if it marked a spring". At the same time, it may be reasonable to see in the adjective a reference to the literary background

¹¹ E.g. *Il.* 16. 391–392 (χαράδραι) ἐς δ' ἄλλα πορφυρέην μεγάλην στενάχουσι ῥέουσαι / ἐξ ὀρέων ἐπιπάῳ "(torrents) groan greatly as they flow headlong from the mountains to the dark sea"; 4.452–455 (a stream bed); of Cleon's voice at Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1034 φωνὴν δ' εἶχεν χαράδρας ὀλεθρὸν τετοκίας "and he had the voice of a death-dealing torrent"; cf. Pherecrates, *PCG* 56; Pollux 6.146 Bethe.

¹² Cf. Elliger (1975) 385–387.

¹³ Berger (1984) 2, drawing on terminology introduced by Harold Bloom, distinguishes between "strong pastoral," which self-consciously "constructs within itself an image of its generic traditions in order to criticize them" and "weak" pastoral, which does not do this.

of the location described at the end of the epigram: Leonidas' pine is ποιμένος not merely because it is the sort of tree known and used as shade by shepherds,¹⁴ but also because it is the sort of tree—in the sort of *locus amoenus*—that is characteristic of “bucolic” poetry.¹⁵ Indeed, the adjective may have a similarly self-referential sense in an overtly programmatic passage of Theocritus 1, where the goatherd, after rejecting Thyrsis' invitation to pipe, invites him to sit and sing “under the elm, opposite the statues of Priapus and the Nymphs, where that shepherd's seat and the oaks are” (21–23 δεῦρ' ὑπὸ τὰν πετέλεον ἐσδώμεθα τῷ τε Πριάπῳ / καὶ τὰν Κρασιάδων κατεναντίον, ἄπερ ὁ θῶκος / τήνος ὁ ποιμενικὸς καὶ ταὶ δρυές). Although it is impossible to know whether the two passages are related to one another, in both cases the adjectives describe a feature of an idyllic landscape, and in both they serve as a marker of genre. By incorporating such a self-consciously “pastoral” tableau into his epigram, Leonidas engages with and comments on the boundaries of the genre, while simultaneously legitimizing epigram as a vehicle for “pastoral” poetry.

The attention that Leonidas' poem calls to the literary background of the bucolic vignette embedded in it underscores the gulf between the idealized world of pastoral poetry and the harsher realities of actual country life. The terms in which the imagined location of the epigram is described further emphasize this disjunction. In particular, since οἰονόμος can mean either “isolated” or “sheep-pasturing”, the phrase ἐπ' οἰονόμοιο admits both the sense “in a lonely place” and “in a sheep pasture”,¹⁶ and although neither interpretation can be excluded, the emphasis that the adjective δαμαλήβοτος places on the feeding of cows retrospectively encourages readers to understand ἐπ' οἰονόμοιο in the latter sense. The countryside that travelers are urged to pass through without stopping is thus conspicuously represented as the place in which animals, including both sheep and heifers, graze, and the poem sharply distinguishes between places frequented by shepherds and those used by the animals under their care, with whom in reality actual herdsmen clearly must have spent considerable time (cf. e.g. Anyte, *APlan.* 231 = *HE* 738ff.). In this respect, the epigram punctures a central presupposition of bucolic poetry (and especially of epigrams

¹⁴ For pine trees as a feature of the bucolic landscape, cf. Plato, *Phdr.* 259a; Theocr. 3.38; 5.49; Myrinus, *AP* 7.703.3 = *GPh* 2570; adesp., *APlan.* 12.1 = *FGE* 1420.

¹⁵ Cf. the use of ποιμενικά (ποιήματα) to refer to a type of “pastoral” poetry in the ancient scholia to Theocritus (*Proleg.* Ca, pp. 3–4 Wendel).

¹⁶ Cf. *HE* vol. 2, 386; Geoghegan (1979) 47–50.

like Anyte, *APlan.* 231 = *HE* 738ff.), that the lives of herdsmen and the animals under their watch are analogous and closely intertwined, though the world it constructs also resembles that created by other pastoral in that it downplays the “professional” responsibilities of herdsmen and instead represents them as occupied primarily with singing and playing music.¹⁷ What makes the epigram notable, however, is that by emphasizing the contrast between pasturing animals (here dismissed as an unpleasant part of rural life in which shepherds appear to play no active part) and sitting at rest in the shade, the poem acknowledges what is almost entirely elided in Theocritus—namely the existence of other, more unpleasant aspects of the countryside and of rural life. In this sense, too, the epigram overtly presents the reader with a choice of two visions of the pastoral world: one in which animals pasture in unappealing surroundings; the other in which shepherds rest and play in an idealized setting.

Kathryn Gutzwiller ((1998) 112–113) has recently observed that the contrast that the epigram draws between the muddy torrent and the limpid and cool stream closely resembles the end of Callimachus’ *Hymn to Apollo*, where the god, defending the poet who sings “not even as much as the sea”, contrasts the torrent of the Euphrates with the small and undefiled spring (ll. 108–112; cf. Callimachus, *AP* 12.43.3–4 = *HE* 1043–1044 “I hate the beloved who gets around, nor do I drink from the spring”; the image is put to anti-Callimachean use by Antipater of Thessalonica, *AP* 11.20.3–4 = *GPh* 187–188). She suggests that the epigram also serves as a metaphor for the poet’s own project, “as an invitation to the reader to abandon the polluted production of more traditional poets in favor of his refreshingly original epigrams on less common topics”. To be sure, the manifest importance of stream water as a metaphor for poetic inspiration in Hellenistic poetry¹⁸ makes it reasonable—despite Hans Bernsdorff’s skepticism¹⁹—to see in the epigram’s exhortation that its readers choose one type of water over another a self-reflexive comment on the poet’s own literary activities and values. Indeed, the implicit point of the poem—that readers will find it worth their while to make their way to an out-of-the-way spot off the beaten path—resembles the Callimachean recommendation that poets choose the path less traveled (cf. Callim. fr. 1.25–28

¹⁷ Cf. e.g., Fantuzzi, this volume, p. 237.

¹⁸ Cf., e.g., Knox (1985) 109–119, Argentieri (2003) 94–98.

¹⁹ Bernsdorff (2001) 147 n. 209.

Pfeiffer = Massimilla).²⁰ At a basic level, the speaker's insistence that readers take the additional effort to reach an overtly "pastoral" (cf. ποιημένος) *locus amoenus* may thus be understood as an exhortation to write (and read) pastoral poetry. If so, however, the tone of the exhortation is playful: the speaker, after all, does not invite readers to join him in an idyllic setting, as do the speakers of Anyte's epigrams and the herdsmen of Theocritean poetry, but rather sends them away to another world of which he pretends to have no part. The epigram thus engages in a clever generic game, in which Leonidas endorses the values of pastoral poetry—which he treats as an established form with fixed conventions—even while purporting, ironically, to stand at some distance from them and implicitly acknowledging the selectivity with which pastoral poetry represents the rural landscape.

Because in real life verse inscriptions so often marked artifacts—especially tombs, but also statues and other objects dedicated to the gods—literary epigram as a form is in a broad sense an obvious vehicle for poetic self-reflection, and several other Hellenistic poets use the conventions of funerary and dedicatory inscriptions to call attention to the artificiality of their own depiction of the "realistic" natural world. Nicias, *AP* 9.315 = *HE* 2771 ff. is an excellent example:

Ἴζευν ὑπ' αἰγείροισιν, ἐπεὶ κάμεξ, ἐνθάδ', ὁδίτα,
καὶ πῖθ' ἄσσον ἰὼν πίδακος ἀμετέρας,
μῆσαι δὲ κῶραναι καὶ ἀπόπροσθι, ἂν ἐπὶ Γύλλῳ
Σίμος ἀποφθιμένῳ παιδί παριδρύεται.

Sit here under the poplars, traveler, since you are tired, and coming closer drink from our water. And remember, even when you are far away, the spring that Simus is having built for his dead child Gillus.

The opening injunction for the passerby to sit (Ἴζευν) also appears at the beginning of Anyte, *AP* 9.313 = *HE* 726 ff., where the addressee is similarly invited to refresh himself from the nearby spring:

Ἴζευν τᾷσδ' ὑπὸ καλὰ δάφνας εὐθαλέα φύλλα
ὥρσιον τ' ἄρυσαι νάματος ἀδὺ πόμα,
ὄφρα τοι ἀσθμαίνοντα πόνοις θέρεος φίλα γυῖα
ἀμπαύσης πνοιᾷ τυπτόμενα Ζεφύρου.

Sit under the beautiful burgeoning leaves of this laurel, and draw a sweet drink from the seasonal stream, so that you may rest your limbs, panting with the labors of summer and beaten by the gust of Zephyr.

²⁰ It is perhaps significant that the adjective εὐζηνος is elsewhere attested only at Callim. fr. 75.72 Pf.

The epigrams of Nicias show several other points of contact with poems by Anyte,²¹ and it is thus highly likely that one of these poems was composed with the other in mind. Since Richard Reitzenstein, who saw Nicias' epigram as a novel variation of the inscriptional form of Anyte's poem,²² scholars have widely assumed that Anyte was the earlier writer, but Bernsdorff has recently challenged this view,²³ arguing that none of the parallels between the two authors unambiguously shows Nicias to be the borrower. Bernsdorff is surely correct to note that any resemblance of Anyte's poem to an actual inscription does not *per se* guarantee its priority,²⁴ but a closer look at the way the two poems draw on bucolic motifs offers strong support for the view that Anyte was Nicias' model.

The respite offered by springs in the countryside appears as a theme in four of Anyte's epigrams. One of these (*APlan.* 291 = *HE* 672ff.) takes a form common in dedicatory inscriptions ("x dedicated this gift (τόδε ... δῶρον) to y"),²⁵ and purports to be a record of an offering made to Pan and the Nymphs in thanksgiving for the refreshing water they provided Theudotus in his exhaustion from the summer heat. In another (*AP* 9.314 = *HE* 730ff.), the speaker represents himself as the god Hermes, who stands along the road by a breezy orchard near the sea, providing respite to weary travelers. The text of the final verse has been much discussed,²⁶ but it seems certain to contain a reference to a spring, and the implicit point, which emerges from the background provided by other epigrams of Anyte, may be that the speaker is a statue that has been dedicated (the intransitive perfect ἔσταια here being tantamount to "I have been set up") by a traveler who found refreshment from the surroundings. If so, both these epigrams account for the immediate presence of a dedication in an appealing place by evoking, implicitly or explicitly, a moment from the past at which a traveler received succor (cf. Leonidas, *AP* 9.326). By contrast, Anyte,

²¹ Anyte, *AP* 6.123 = *HE* 664ff. seems related to Nicias, *AP* 6.122 = *HE* 2755ff.; Anyte, *AP* 7.202 = *HE* 704ff. to Nicias, *AP* 7.200 = *HE* 2767; Anyte, *AP* 9.314 = *HE* 730ff. to Nicias, *APlan.* 188 = *HE* 2779ff.

²² Reitzenstein (1893) 123–125.

²³ Bernsdorff (2001) 110–117.

²⁴ Bernsdorff (2001) 116. Cf. Gutzwiller (1998) 71 on the difference between the epigrammatic voice of this poem and that of real inscriptions. Nicias' poem is on the surface more overtly "inscriptional", though that fact also has no bearing on its chronological relationship to Anyte.

²⁵ E.g. *CEG* 744.

²⁶ Cf. Geoghegan (1979) 157–160.

AP 9.313 = *HE* 726ff. is, like *APlan.* 228 = *HE* 734ff., set entirely in the present, except insofar as the addressee who is invited into the *locus amoenus* is represented as exhausted from prior labors. Although the epigram itself presents itself as an inscription erected in a grove, there is no explicit reference to a dedication, and the speaking voice is in fact not clearly identifiable (and thus, as Gutzwiller has noted, can easily be associated with the voice of the poet²⁷). Nor is there any specific reference to human intervention in landscape, or to the presence of artifacts. Instead, we find only the entirely “natural” features conventionally found in literary *loca amoena*: the shade of trees, refreshing water from a spring, and (in the case of *APlan.* 228.2 = *HE* 735) a gentle breeze. The epigrams imagine the moment at which the aid of a *locus amoenus* is offered to a traveler—with no indication of whether it was accepted—rather than the consequences of that aid and the artifice that it inspired.

Nicias’ poem begins, in much the same way, with an invitation to passersby to enjoy the shade of trees and the cool water flowing there, and readers are thus led to expect a conventional *locus amoenus* of the sort widespread in bucolic poetry.²⁸ Only in the second half of the epigram does the crucial difference between Nicias’ landscape and that of other early bucolic poetry become clear. The noun *κρήνη* may denote either a spring in the natural form it emerges from the ground or a fountain constructed around a natural spring to channel and retain its water. In other early Hellenistic bucolic *loca amoena*, the noun denotes unelaborated springs²⁹ or at least does not obviously and explicitly refer to a man-made object.³⁰ So, too, in this epigram, the water mentioned in the first pentameter appears initially to be that of a natural spring, and the third and fourth verses are constructed in such a way that only on reaching the very end of the epigram do readers discover that they must reinterpret the meaning of *κρήνη*, which here refers to a

²⁷ Gutzwiller (1998) 71.

²⁸ The narrator is not explicitly identified, though as commentators note, the 1st-person plural possessive adjective *ἡμετέρας* in connection with the water to be found there might reasonably lead readers to imagine that the speakers of the epigram are nymphs, which is to say that one might conceive of an inscription associated with a representation of them.

²⁹ Cf. Theocr. 3.4; 5.3; 47; 6.3; 7.6 (brought into existence by Chalcon’s kick, but not obviously adorned by a fountain); [8].37; 13.39.

³⁰ For an epigram on a fountain house (not embedded in a *locus amoenus*), cf. *FGE* 1718ff.

fountain house Simus has had built around the natural spring. Thus what seems initially to be a description of a natural *locus amoenus* like those in Theocritus and Anyte turns out, in the course of the epigram, to have been altered and enhanced by human intervention.

Some of the point of the poem, in other words, hinges on the way it blurs the line between nature and art, since its *κρήνη*—a traditional feature of bucolic *loca amoenae*—turns out to be a man-made edifice. It is tempting, therefore, to see in Nicias' epigram, as in Leonidas', a reflection on bucolic poetry in general (and on its idealized character in particular). Simus' construction of a fountain, an object that contains and controls the water from a natural spring, may be read as a metaphor for the basic project of pastoral poetry, the production of a self-contained and artificial portrait of the natural world, but in any case, the epigram engages with the themes and conventions of bucolic poetry, and this fact has important implications for its chronological relationship to Anyte, *AP* 9.313 = *HE* 726ff. Individual arguments about relative order of composition can rarely be certain, but since it seems likely that one of the poems was written with the other in mind, and since Nicias appears to be manipulating and perhaps commenting on the traditional imagery of the bucolic *locus amoenus*, the simplest explanation is that he is reworking Anyte's more conventional representation of the rural landscape.

Some support for this view may be found in Nicias' play with time and space. Whereas Anyte *AP* 9.313 = *HE* 726ff. and *APlan.* 228 = *HE* 734ff. merely invite passersby into a *locus amoenus*, with no reference to the consequences of their visit, the temporal and spatial scheme of Nicias' poem is more complex, since it envisions the addressee looking back from a distance on his experience, and encourages him to "remember" (*μνᾶσαι*) the fountain. Elsewhere in Hellenistic poetry, the verb *μνησέω* may, like Latin *memini*, serve to signal literary recollection and reuse.³¹ The speaker's plea that his addressee remember the fountain even when he is in a distant place may thus perhaps be understood as a self-reflective expression of hope on the part of the poet that his epigram will have a place in an ongoing tradition in the future, but it also captures and reflects the experience of the actual reader, who can enjoy the *locus amoenus* described in the poem only from the distant vantage point of his study.

³¹ Cf. Sens (2003) 306–308.

The epigram, however, also conspicuously imagines an earlier time, the point at which Simus constructed the fountain, and indeed, the present tense *παριδρύεται*, “is setting up” suggests that the fictional time of the poem is simultaneous with the construction of that monument. In this sense, the poem resembles Anyte, *APlan.* 291 = *HE* 671 ff., which, as we saw, is couched as a dedicatory inscription recording a gift given in thanks for the respite provided by an idyllic spring. By contrast, Simus erects his fountain not to give thanks, but to mark the tomb of his dead son. In locating the grave of Gillus within a *locus amoenus*, the poem introduces to the idyllic landscape a tomb, a monument that is one of the most obviously traditional features of the epigrammatic tradition.³² At the same time, the poem also seems to play with a basic theme in other epigrams of this sort, namely that the idealized settings they depict are places of rest and refreshment for travelers: here, too, the traveler is invited to pause, but he will do so in the company of one experiencing a more permanent *ἄμπανμα*.³³ Simus’ reasons for setting up the grave where he has remain obscure, however, and the tomb thus stands out as an unusual feature of the *locus amoenus*, in sharp distinction to the objects dedicated in implicit or explicit thanksgiving in Anyte’s poetry; here the tomb is not the speaker’s focus, as it would be in a funerary epigram, but an unexplained marker of human intrusion into what initially seems to be an idealized natural setting. Once again, the difference between Anyte and Nicias seems most easily explained if we suppose that Nicias was looking to epigrams purporting to record or describe dedications of objects in idyllic locations but has instead incorporated into his poem a monument of a rather different sort, while also complicating the simple temporal and spatial scheme of his direct model by imagining a time at which his addressee will be far away.

Since it seems likely that the Nicias who composed the epigram was the man who is addressed at the opening of Theocritus’ *Id.* 11 and 13,³⁴ it follows that, if the considerations advanced above are correct, at least some of Anyte’s epigrams were composed before or around the same time as Theocritus’ bucolic poetry. Because the relationship among these poets is a matter of some importance for understanding

³² In this sense the grave may serve as a sort of generic “marker” that calls attention to epitaphic background of epigram as a form.

³³ For *ἀναπαύεσθαι* and its cognates of the sleep of death, e.g. Asclep. *AP* 12.50.8 = *HE* 887; Callim. *AP* 7.524.1 = *HE* 1187; Leon. *AP* 7.408.2 = *HE* 2326; *GVI* 876.5. Mnasalca *AP* 7.171 = *HE* 2631 ff. juxtaposes rest in the countryside with death.

³⁴ *HE* vol. 2, 428–429.

the background to Theocritean bucolic, it is particularly unfortunate that most of the various points of contact between Anyte and other 3rd-cent. poets provide little information about relative chronology. There is, however, at least one other passage that may provide some additional evidence for an early dating of Anyte. Toward the end of the first book of Apollonius' *Argonautica*, the narrator compares the moment of the Argonauts' arrival in Mysia to the evening homecoming of an exhausted gardener or plowman (1.1172–1181):

ἦμος δ' ἀγρόθεν εἶσι φντοσκάφος ἢ τις ἀροτρεὺς
 ἀσπασίως εἰς αὐλιν ἔην, δόρποιο χατίζων,
 αὐτοῦ δ' ἐν προμολῇ τετρυμένα γούνατ' ἔκαμψεν
 αὐσταλέος κονίησι, περιτριβέας δέ τε χεῖρας
 εἰσορόων κακὰ πολλὰ ἐπ' ἡρήσατο γαστρί·
 τῆμος ἄρ' οἱ γ' ἀφίκοντο Κιανίδος ἡθεα γαίης
 ἄμφ' Ἀργανθώνειον ὄρος προχοάς τε Κίοιο.
 τοὺς μὲν ἐνξείνως Μυσοὶ φιλότῃτι κiónτας
 δειδέχασ' ἐνναέται κείνης χθονός, ἦιά τε σφι
 μῆλ' αὖτε δευομένοις μέθυ τ' ἄσπετον ἐγγυάλιξαν.

At the hour when a gardener or plowman, hungry for supper, is glad to return from the fields to his hut, and, filthy with dust, squats down on his weary knees in the entrance to pour curses on his belly and stare at his worn hands, at that hour the heroes reached the Cianid land near Mount Arganthonion and the mouth of the Cios. The Mysians who inhabit the land received them hospitably, as they came in friendship, and supplied their need for provisions, sheep, and wine in great quantity.

Scholars have observed that l. 1174 shares a verbal resemblance to Anyte, *APlan.* 228.1 = *HE* 734 ξεῖν', ὑπὸ τὰν πέτρων τετρυμένα γυῖ' ἀνάπαυσσον quoted above (p. 150), in which the perfect passive participle of τρύω—a form elsewhere attested in hexameter verse only at Nicander, *Ther.* 227 (also in this metrical position, though in a different case and context)³⁵—occurs in the same case, number and metrical position; in both cases, the participle describes body parts—γυῖα in the one case, γούνατα in the other, though the point of both is clearly the same—and is followed by the noun it modifies and then the verb of which it is the object. More important, there is a broader thematic connection between the passages, both of which depict the moment at which a traveler reaches a place of rest. In Apollonius, the simile in which the phrase occurs prepares for the narrative that follows, and its implicit point is not only that, like the gardener or plowman, the Arg-

³⁵ τρύω is not attested in Homer.

onauts reach Mysia in the evening, but also that like him they arrive exhausted, so that the hospitality provided by their hosts is both especially timely and welcome. So too, the addressee of Anyte's epigram is a weary stranger, who is invited by the speaker to rest and avail himself of benefits offered by the natural world. Finally, in Apollonius the exhausted traveler is imagined to be a rustic, so that in both passages the imagined setting is the countryside.³⁶ While it would be easy to imagine that both Apollonius and Anyte drew their use of τετρυμένα of legs from some common antecedent, the cumulative effect of these thematic and verbal points of contact does suggest that one passage is designed to recall the other.

At a basic level, Apollonius' temporal simile is modeled on Homeric passages like *Il.* 11.86–89, which locates the breaking of Trojan ranks at the moment that a woodcutter prepares dinner after a hard day's work, or *Od.* 13.31–34, where Odysseus' fasting is compared to the hunger of plowman in the evening, and is characteristic of epic similes more generally in that it connects the events of the heroic world to experiences of more humble, "ordinary" people. Apollonius' expression γούνατ' ἔκαμψε alludes to *Od.* 5.453–454, where Odysseus' behavior on his arrival on Phaeacia after a particularly exhausting and dangerous journey is described in similar terms (ὁ δ' ἄρ' ἄμφω γούνατ' ἔκαμψε / χεῖράς τε σιβαράς, "he bent both knees and strong hands"), but this literary fact has no bearing on the question of priority, since it is easy to suppose that Apollonius combined a reworking of Anyte with a reference to a contextually relevant passage of Homer.³⁷ Nor is it helpful to try to determine whether τετρυμένα γυῖ(α) or τετρυμένα γούνα(α) is less suited to its context and thus more likely to be inspired by the other: as Bernsdorff notes, neither seems more or less appropriate.³⁸ Another, potentially more fruitful, approach is to consider whether borrowing by one of the two poets has a special literary point—to ask, in other words, whether the evocation of one passage would have a particular literary

³⁶ It may not be wholly accidental that the only other extant passage in which the participle is used of body parts also connects the exhaustion in question with agrarian labor (Plato, *Leg.* 761d πόνοις τετρυμένα γεωργικοῖς σώματα, "bodies worn by farmers' labors"); it is later associated with related contexts also at Adaeus, *AP* 6.228.1 = *GPh* 1 Αὔλακι καὶ γήρᾳ τετρυμένον ἐργατίνην βοῦν, "His laboring ox, worn out by the furrow and old age"; Marianus, *AP* 9.627.1–2 Τῆδ' ὑπὸ τὰς πλατάνους ἀπαλῶ τετρυμένος ὕπνῳ / εὖδεν Ἔρως, "Here under the plane trees Eros slept, worn down by gentle sleep".

³⁷ Anyte's γυῖ ἄμπαυσον finds a parallel elsewhere in her corpus at *AP* 9.313.3–4 = *HE* 728f.: φίλα γυῖα / ἀμπαύσης.

³⁸ Bernsdorff (2001) 118–119.

effect that would be lacking if the direction of influence were reversed. This approach, which necessarily involves a degree of circularity, must be used with great caution and can never be decisive *per se*, but when applied to these two passages may offer a smaller glimmer of support for the view that Anyte's epigram was anterior to the *Argonautica*.³⁹

As we have noticed, Apollonius' simile is thematically relevant to the surrounding narrative, in that it suggests the exhaustion of the Argonauts at the time of their arrival among the Mysians and thus the significance of the kindly reception they are afforded there. The simile itself, however, describes only the fatigue of the rustic worker rather than the specifics of any refreshment he receives—readers learn only that he was happy to come home (1173 ἀσπασίως). In this context, an allusion to Anyte's epigram would help elucidate and enrich the implicit point of the simile, since it would suggest that the rustic laborer's arrival at his hut brings him respite like that received by the traveler who reaches her *locus amoenus*. A reminiscence of Apollonius by Anyte, on the other hand, might serve to emphasize her traveler's fatigue by associating it with that of his rustic worker, but an allusion in this direction seems less obviously meaningful in a context in which the focus is on the goods to be provided by the landscape rather than on the tribulations that have brought the passerby there. As we have observed, such an approach to the allusion cannot in itself prove that Apollonius was the borrower, but it is nonetheless highly suggestive. It is thus worth adding that, if the view that Apollonius' simile looks to Anyte's poem is correct, the allusion may also have the effect of de-romanticizing the experience of the rural traveler as it is represented in the epigram. In incorporating an allusion to Anyte into his account of the discomfort of the exhausted gardener or plowman, who arrives home dirty and starving, his hands worn by his labor, Apollonius may be seen to engage with his model in a manner common in Hellenistic poetry—that is, to reuse an idealizing model in a more “realistic” and humble context.

Taken cumulatively, then, the literary evidence provided by Nicias' epigram and by Apollonius, parts of whose *Argonautica* seem to predate at least some of Theocritus' bucolic idylls,⁴⁰ offers some support for

³⁹ Luck (1967) 32 claims that the connection between the passages (noticed by *HE ad loc.*) suggests that Anyte postdates Apollonius; this view is rightly questioned by Bernsdorff (2001) 118–119, who finds no evidence in the passages for the priority of either poet.

⁴⁰ Theocritus' *Id.* 22, at any rate, seems both to presuppose the prior existence of bucolic poetry and Apollonius' *Argonautica* (cf. Sens (1997) 24–33 and 119 on *Id.* 22.54–

what has been the traditional view that at least part of Anyte's corpus was composed before, and thus presumably known by, Theocritus. Anyte's depiction of pastoral life, however, is considerably less complex than one finds in Theocritean pastoral, in which pain, especially the anguish caused by love, plays an obvious and pervasive part; Anyte's poetry offers no sense that human beings' relationship to the rural landscape and the animals in it are anything but wholly sympathetic, or that sexual desire and the suffering it causes impinge on the rural landscape.⁴¹ The contrast between these two visions of the pastoral world leaves open the question of what constitutes pastoral, and thus how the successors of these early practitioners would define the genre. Indeed, in at least one other early Hellenistic epigram the intersection of Eros and the rural landscape is treated as an overt problem.

Mnasalcas, *AP* 9.324 = *HE* 2663ff. is designed as an address to a *syrix* that has been left by a shepherd in the temple of Aphrodite:

Ἄ σῦριγξ, τί τοι ὧδε παρ' Ἀφρογένειαν ὄρουσας;
τίπτ' ἀπὸ ποιμενίου χεῖλος ὧδε πάρει;
οὐ τοι προῶνες ἔθ' ὧδ' οὐτ' ἄγγεα, πάντα δ' Ἔρωτες
καὶ Πόθος· ἅ δ' ἀγρία Μοῦσ' ἐν ὄρει μενέτω.

Syrix, why did you rush here to the temple of Aphrodite? Why have you come here from the lip of a shepherd? You don't have hills and dales here anymore, but everything is Loves and Desire. Let the rustic Muse remain in the mountains.

As in the epigram by Leonidas that we considered earlier, the fictive setting of the poem lies outside the idealized 'pastoral' world. The imagined location is a temple of Aphrodite, and the speaker points out how distant it is from the proper world of the *syrix*. The basic conceit of the epigram is thus that the pastoral world exists and belongs elsewhere, and the speaker treats the *syrix* as a strange and not particularly welcome intruder in Aphrodite's sphere. In a general sense, the poem resembles a number of other Hellenistic epigrams in which the narrator purports to be looking at and addressing an object that he finds notable in some way. More specifically, the speaker's puzzlement about the apparently incongruous location of the *syrix* finds a parallel in other epigrams in which the speaker wonders about odd features of an artifact, as in a series of epigrams whose narrators express confusion

74). For a different view, cf. Köhnken (1965) and (2001).

⁴¹ Cf. Hunter (1999) 13–17.

about a representation of Aphrodite in armor.⁴² A poem ascribed to a certain Antimachus, *AP* 9.321 = *FGE* 45ff. (Antimachus, fr. dub. 149 Wyss = [205] Matthews), is an interesting example:

Τίπτε μόθων ἄτλητος Ἐνναλίοιο λέλογχας,
 Κύπρι; τίς ὁ ψεύστας στυγνὰ καθάρπε μάτην
 ἔντεα; σοὶ γάρ Ἐρωτες ἐφίμεροι ἅ τε κατ' εὐνάν
 τέρψις καὶ κροτάλων θηλυμανεῖς ὄτοβοι.
 δούρατα δ' αἱματόεντα· κάθεσ Τριτωνίδι δίᾳ
 ταῦτα, σὺ δ' εὐχαίταν εἰς Ὑμέναιον ἴθι.

Why Cypris, inexperienced as you are with war, have Mars' battles befallen you? What falsifier attached this hateful armor in vain? To you the Erotes are desirable, and the pleasure to be found in bed, and girls' mad crashing of castanets. Spears are bloody; leave them for bright Athena, and go to Hymenaeus of the beautiful locks.

This epigram, which seems unlikely to be by Antimachus of Colophon and is probably of Hellenistic date,⁴³ offers an instructive parallel for Mnascalas' poem, with which it shares its basic rhetorical structure (both poems open with a pair of questions, and conclude with an imperative). As other poems on the same topic make clear, the subject of Antimachus' epigram is an image of Aphrodite as she is represented at Sparta.⁴⁴ What makes this and other similar poems (e.g. Leon. *APlan.* 171 = *HE* 2585ff.) interesting for our purposes is the narrator's professed ignorance about the reasons that Aphrodite is so depicted. According to Quintilian (*Inst.* 2.4.26), topics like *cur armata apud Lacedaemonios Venus* were common as school exercises in his youth, but for Hellenistic readers the supposed incongruity of an armed Aphrodite will probably have seemed exaggerated, since her weapons—like those of the Erotes with whom the epigram explicitly associates her—were a regular amatory theme (e.g. Asclep. *AP* 12.161.2 = *HE* 903; Theocr. 11.16, with Gow *ad loc.*).⁴⁵

Something similar may be said for Mnascalas' poem. At the opening of the epigram, the narrator expresses surprise that the *syrix* has come, apparently of its own volition, from the "lip of a shepherd" to Aphrodite's realm, but the reason for the instrument's presence there

⁴² Cf. *HE* vol. 2, 334, 397.

⁴³ For the question of authorship of this poem, cf. *FGE* 15, Matthews (1996) 427–428.

⁴⁴ Cf. *HE* vol. 2, 334, 397–398, Flemberg (1991) 29–42, Magnelli (1999) 244–246.

⁴⁵ The other example of a school exercise cited by Quintilian in this passage involves an explicitly erotic question (*quid ita crederetur Cupido puer atque volucer et sagittis ac face armatus?*).

will, though unstated, have been easily inferred by readers: a shepherd has fallen in love and dedicated his instrument to the goddess, much as in Lycophronides, *PMG* 844, a love-sick goatherd makes an offering of various articles, including his hunting spear, on the grounds that his “mind has been poured elsewhere for a beautiful girl dear to the Graces,” which is to say that he no longer has time for his usual pursuits. Indeed, at Theocr. 1.128–130, Daphnis asks Pan to carry off his *syrix*, which he describes as “well-bound with respect to the lip”,⁴⁶ on the grounds that he is dying from Love (ἐνθ’ ὄναξ, καὶ τάνδε φέρει πακτοῖο μελίπνον / ἐκ κηρῶ σύριγγα καλὸν περὶ χεῖλος ἐλικτάν / ἢ γὰρ ἐγὼν ὑπ’ Ἔρωτος ἐς Αἶδαν ἔλκομαι ἤδη, “come, my lord, take this pipe breathing honey from its compacted wax and well bound to the lip. Already I am being dragged to Hades by Eros”). It is tempting to imagine, though impossible to prove, that Mnasalcas, whose likely dates make him a close contemporary or successor to Theocritus,⁴⁷ had this passage specifically in mind, but in any case the epigram engages with a duality that runs through—and is treated as a problem in—Theocritean poetry, where the idealized calm of the pastoral landscape stands in opposition to the erotic turmoil that so regularly anguishes its occupants.⁴⁸ The speaker of Mnasalcas’ poem defines the world of the *syrix* wholly in physical terms,⁴⁹ as a place of hills and vales (πρῶνες ... ἄγκρα) set far off in the mountains, ἐν ὄρει—a phrase that at Theocr. 7.51 serves as a sort of marker for the idealized place in which shepherds sing their songs (τοῦθ’ ὅτι πρᾶν ἐν ὄρει τὸ μελύδριον ἐξεπόνασα, “this song which recently I fashioned on the mountain”)⁵⁰—and a place from which, by implication, Eros is absent.

Mnasalcas’ epigram, in imputing to its speaker the view that the pastoral and erotic worlds are unbridgeably distinct, seems to presume a construction of a rustic landscape in which love *does* play a significant part, and although it is impossible to prove Mnasalcas composed it with Theocritean pastoral in mind, the poem is considerably richer if we suppose that he did. If so, the tone, as in the epigram by Leonidas that

⁴⁶ On this difficult phrase, cf. Hunter (1999) 101–102; Bernsdorff (2001) 162, who takes a different view, calls attention to the frequency of references to “lips” in passages relating to the *syrix*.

⁴⁷ *HE* vol. 2, 400; Bernsdorff (2001) 122–123.

⁴⁸ Cf. Bernsdorff (2001) 163–164; Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi-Hunter (2004) 176.

⁴⁹ Bernsdorff (2001) 162.

⁵⁰ For the world of shepherds characterized as the “mountains”, cf. Theocr. 3.46; 7.87, 92; Sens (1997) 105 on *Id.* 22.36.

we considered above, is playful and ironic: Mnasalcas' naive speaker is made to express a view of the pastoral world that is manifestly at odds with the "reality" that appears in the work of a contemporary. In this regard, the speaker's representation of the *syrix*'s song, and by extension pastoral poetry,⁵¹ as the product of ἡ ἀγρία Μοῦσα is interesting. For although that phrase at an obvious level refers to "country song", the adjective ἄγριος is regularly used in a more pejorative sense to denote that which is "wild" and "uncivilized" as opposed to that which is cultivated,⁵² and the final phrase, in which the music of the *syrix* is represented as a crude and unwelcome intruder in the more sophisticated erotic world of the speaker, thus suggests—or allows for—both condescension and hostility on the part of the speaker: such unrefined song should stay where it belongs. In this we need see no real criticism of pastoral poetry in general or particular, or any polemical contribution to a contemporary discussion about the proper subject-matter for the genre.⁵³ Instead, the speaker's understanding of pastoral song amusingly evokes the productive tensions inherent in contemporary pastoral poetry: the tension between rusticity of subject-matter and elegance of expression, and that between the uncomplicated *hesychia* of the natural world and the turmoil of the humans who reside in it.

Thus, in representing an outsider's perspective on pastoral song, Mnasalcas' epigram playfully calls attention to the problem of defining generic limits. At some level, the *syrix*, an article of bucolic paraphernalia that has—at least in the view of the speaker—intruded into a realm in which it is out of place, can perhaps be read as a nice analog to pastoral poetry, in which sophisticated urban readers are confronted with a stylized and remote rural landscape. Seen in this light, the speaker's puzzlement, too, may reflect the experience of the reader of a genre defined by its unsettled tensions and dichotomies.

⁵¹ The view of Bernsdorff (2001) 163, that the *syrix* in Mnasalcas' poem represents only the music of the instrument and the song of goatherds and need not stand for pastoral poetry in a larger sense, seems difficult to sustain.

⁵² By contrast, in Meleager, *AP* 7.196.2 = *HE* 4067 ἀγρονόμαν ... μοῦσαν ἐρημιόλαον, "the rustic Muse who chatters in isolated places" (of a τέτυξ), where the rural landscape is treated as the "remedy" for love, ἀγρονόμαν has none of the pejorative force immanent in ἄγριος. On this poem, see Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi-Hunter (2004) 177–178.

⁵³ Cf. Reitzenstein (1893) 130–131; Rosenmeyer (1969) 77: "I like to think that the poet was seriously concerned about a tendency which, he feared, might work against the desired mood of simplicity".

THE IDEA OF BUCOLIC IN THE IMITATORS OF THEOCRITUS, 3RD–1ST CENTURY BC

HANS BERNSDORFF

1. *Corpus*

The period under review in this paper spans the time between the two greats of ancient bucolic poetry: Theocritus, whose poetic activity extended from the late 80s to the middle of the 3rd century BC, and Virgil, whose *Eclogues* are to be dated to the late 40s and early 30s of the 1st century BC. The period covered here thus corresponds with that of Hellenism after its early Alexandrian representatives.¹

Within this period I will concentrate on those texts that closely follow Theocritus' poems on herdsmen. I thus include only those poems that are at least written in the same metre (dactylic hexameter) and in a dialect of Doric colouring, and are concerned with herdsmen.² Consequently, the reception of Theocritus' pastoral poetry in other formally distinct genres (e.g. in epigram)³ and also texts following Theocritus in metre and dialect, but not in subject-matter (e.g. [Theocr.] 23 on an unhappy lover or several fragments of Moschus or Bion) can only be addressed in passing here, even though, both in antiquity and in recent times, they have frequently been attributed to the bucolic genre⁴

¹ The lower end is confirmed by the date of the first documented collection of bucolic poetry (probably of Theocritus and his successors) that was compiled by the grammarian Artemidorus of Tharsus in the first half of the 1st century BC (the couplet above the collection is transmitted in *AP* 9.205 = *FGE* 113–114). On the possible form of this collection, which had probably been available to Virgil, cf. Gutzwiller (1996a) 123–128.

² I shall refer to poems whose subject-matter meets these criteria as “pastoral”.

³ Cf. Bernsdorff (2001) and, particularly on epigram, Sens' paper in this volume.

⁴ Stobaeus quotes non-pastoral fragments of Moschus and Bion from the βουκολικά; in [Moschus] 3, Bion is seen by his student as a bucolic poet only; together with Theocritus, Moschus and Bion were regarded as the bucolic triad: see Reed's paper in this volume, §1. The metrical, linguistic and thematic coherence between the ps.-Theocritean *Id.* 19, 20, 23, 27, which he dates to the 2nd and 1st century BC, is demonstrated by Trovati (2001).

and of course represent important reactions to Theocritean pastoral poetry.⁵

The corpus thus delineated overall coincides with the pastoral poems found in some or all of the bucolic manuscripts, with the exception of poems by Theocritus or epigrams. These are either poems transmitted under the name of Theocritus which, however, cannot have been written by him (ps.-Theocritea), or those which have been correctly or incorrectly attributed to Moschus of Syracuse (ca. 150 BC)⁶ or Bion (between the mid-2nd and mid-1st century BC). In the case of both of these authors, we also have to take into account quotes from their *βουκολικά*, most of which have been transmitted via Stobaeus.⁷ Within these limits we are presented with the following texts:⁸

[Theocr.] *Id.* 8 (*Boukoliastai*):⁹ the cowherd Daphnis encounters the shepherd Menalcas. They decide to hold a singing contest, name the prize for the winner and choose a goatherd as judge, who subsequently declares Daphnis the winner of the contest. Daphnis rejoices, while Menalcas

⁵ E.g. Bion's *Epitaph for Adonis*, which represents a clear variation on the sufferings of Daphnis portrayed in *Id.* 1 (Hubbard (1998) 40–41), or Moschus fr. 3, in which Alpheus and Arethusa are doubtlessly meant to reflect Polyphemus and Galatea from Theocr. *Id.* 6 and 11, cf. Bernsdorff (2005).

⁶ Among the genuine poems of Moschus, however, there is none that explicitly focuses on the world of herdsmen as their central theme (perhaps fr. 1, cf. ll. 11–12).

⁷ Additional pieces of papyrus which may perhaps contain bucolic poetry are too fragmentary to allow a treatment in our present context: *SH* 902 (PHamb. 2.121, of the 2nd century BC, see Vox (1997) 493), PKöln 8.32 (1st century BC/1st century AD). Due to the lack of Doric dialect features, I consider the *Fragmentum bucolicum Vindobonense* (PVind. Rainer 29801) as irrelevant, cf. Bernsdorff (1999) 24–25.

⁸ [Theocr.] *Id.* 19 (*Eros as a honey-thief*), [Theocr.] *Id.* 21 (*Halieis*) and Bion fr. 13 (about a birdcatcher) are no pastoral poems, even though all three are set in a rural sphere. The fishermen in *Id.* 21 represent a profession akin to that of the herdsmen; at the same time we find a form of dialogue modelled on Theocritus. As far as the fragments of Moschus and Bion are concerned, one has to consider the possibility that a pastoral context may sometimes be hidden due to the short length of the fragments and Stobaeus' predominantly gnomological interests. Nauta (1990) 134 points out that, although eight of Stobaeus' quotes from Theocritus stem from pastoral poems, we can only see this in two instances.

⁹ Since Valckenaer (late 18th century) various points have been raised against Theocritus' authorship of the whole or parts of this poem, some of them more cogent than others, cf. Gow (1952) vol. 2, 170–171 and later particularly Merkelbach (1956) and Rossi (1971a); on research since Gow cf. Köhnken (1995) 297–299. Although the uncertainty concerning many of the indications discussed—particularly in the use of dialect and in stylistic matters: see Gow (1952) vol. 2, 171 and most recently Hunter (2002) 96–99, both of whom, however, consider this poem as spurious—and although there have been isolated arguments to the contrary, the view of this poem as spurious can today be seen as the *communis opinio*. Its authenticity has been most recently questioned by Fantuzzi

mourns. From this point onwards Daphnis takes a leading role among the herdsmen; furthermore he marries Nais, whom he had praised in his song.¹⁰ The most important Theocritean models are *Id.* 5 and 6.

[Theocr.] *Id.* 9 (*Boukoliastai*):¹¹ a speaker, whose name we are not told and who later (l. 22) turns out to be the narrator, invites Daphnis and Menalcas to sing after each other. As a reward, Daphnis receives a

(1998) 61–62 and Rossi (2000), who in contrast to (1971a) aims to present the author of *Id.* 8 not as a clumsy forger, but as an artful imitator of Theocritus who puts his cards on the table. Rossi (1971a) 25 considers a composition date fairly soon after Theocritus, perhaps in the second half of the 3rd century; Rossi (2000) 242 claims that this poem displays ignorance of the world of herdsmen, and accounts for this by referring to the author's Alexandrian origin, where a Greek city-dweller in the Nile delta would have been surrounded by a non-Greek speaking society of peasants and herdsmen. Schmidt (1987) 122 also ascribes the poem to a younger contemporary and student of Theocritus who in his view also composed the epyllion of *Id.* 25. Virgil's frequent allusions to *Id.* 8 (Posch (1969) 17–18) are generally seen as an indication that he considered this poem as Theocritean. Hunter (2002) 98–99 rightly points out, however, that the anonymity of the author will have been a basic constant of bucolic poetry also for Virgil (unlike in the *Georgics*, Virgil remains strictly anonymous throughout the *Eclogues*), which is why he may indeed have been able to imitate bucolic poems he does not consider Theocritean. Nevertheless, his adaptation of Bion is limited to fr. 2.17 (~ *Ecl.* 3, 56), cf. Reed (1997) 60. The links to [Moschus] 3 (cf. Clausen [1994] index, s.v.) are too vague to allow identification of direct influence, *pace* Paschalis (1995b) on *Ecl.* 6.

¹⁰ This presupposes Meineke's emendation of the transmitted παῖς into Ναῖς at l. 43.

¹¹ Again, since Valckenaer the authenticity of the whole poem or parts of it have been doubted on the basis of similar linguistic and content-related evidence as in the case of *Id.* 8. These are supported by poetic clumsiness concerning various details, cf. Wilamowitz (1906) 205–209 (“Salonbukolik”, that is to say: “dinner-table bucolic poetry”); Gow (1952) vol. 2, 185–186 (the remarks of Piacenza (1994) on the structure of the priamel at ll. 31–32 are not able to dispel the doubts of Gow and others concerning the plausibility of the comparisons with animals discussed there). Pretagostini (1980) 73 has demonstrated that *Id.* 9 does not contain the two structural features of bipartition and ring composition that are found in all genuinely Theocritean poems. Against this perspective, Irigoin (1975) sees *Id.* 9 as the closing poem of a collection published by Theocritus himself, without however going into details concerning the problem of its authenticity. The (hesitantly expressed) optimism of Piacenza (1994) 169 about a Theocritean authorship is also entirely unfounded. The exact dating is insecure: I can agree with neither Matthews (1994) 26, n. 6, who says that “*Id.* 9 is clearly intended as a follow-up to *Id.* 8” (similarly already Arland (1937) 27), nor with Nauta (1990) 126, n. 46, who considers it possible to prove a direct dependence of *Id.* 8 on 9 on the basis of a number of parallels. The points of contact cited by him are limited to ἄδύ anaphoras and one priamel, i.e. stylistic devices which can be considered as common characteristics of bucolic poetry in general. Another point against Matthews and Nauta had been formulated by Gow (1952) vol. 2, 185, who notes that, unlike in *Id.* 8, Menalcas and Daphnis in *Id.* 9 cannot belong to mythical times given that the narrator is speaking to them. Wilamowitz (1906) 203 thinks that Daphnis and Menalcas are assumed to be known at the beginning of *Id.* 9 because they had been taken over from *Id.* 8; we would, however, expect an exposition of the characters in a narrative

herdsman's crook, Menalcas a conch-shell horn. After this, the narrator tells of the song which he himself had sung to the two herdsmen on another occasion.¹² The most important Theocritean models are *Id.* 5, 6 and 7.

[Theocr.] *Id.* 20 (*Boukoliskos*):¹³ after a short introduction, an anonymous cowherd retells the speech with which the town-dweller Eunice had refused his advances towards her, saying that he was too boorish for her taste. He then rhetorically asks his fellow herdsmen whether he had all of a sudden lost his physical virtues, stresses his musical abilities and his success with women, provides mythical examples of herdsmen who, in spite of their station, were favoured by the gods, and finally wishes the wrath of Cypris unto the arrogant Eunice. Apart from *Id.* 6 and 11, the most important Theocritean model is *Id.* 3.

[Theocr.] *Id.* 27 (*Oaristys*):¹⁴ the beginning of the poem is missing; the majority of what survives (1–66) consists of a stichomythic conversation in which the cowherd Daphnis insistently approaches a shepherdess, whose name only survives in corrupt form, but probably is to be restored as Acrotime. Initially he is without success, with Acrotime's resistance appearing rather calculated.¹⁵ After she has made Daphnis swear that he will never leave her, but henceforth take care of her, she follows

introduction only, and this is just what has been consciously avoided by the author (as Wilamowitz later on says himself). Hubbard (1998) 20, n. 4 suggests that we should assign both *Id.* 8 and 9 to the same author only on the basis of several shared linguistic deviations from Theocritus, but this argument is far from cogent. On further research after Gow (1952) cf. Köhnken (1995) 299–300.

¹² If we accept the $\pi\alpha\tau'$ transmitted at l. 29 and do not follow Meineke in reading $\tau\alpha\tau'$, cf. Gow (1952) *ad loc.*

¹³ Since Heinsius it has not been attributed to Theocritus anymore because of several linguistic and metrical deviations, but particularly because of numerous imitations of undoubtedly genuine works of Theocritus (overview in Gow (1952) vol. 2, 364). It is not unlikely that the exemplum of Adonis quoted at ll. 35f. echoes the wording of Bion's *Epitaph for Adonis* (13–14, 68): cf. Reed (1997) 59, with reference to further points of contact between the two poems. This points to a date of composition in the late Hellenistic period at the very earliest; a similar suggestion is made by Matthews (1990) 32–33 who, because of the use of Dorisms, dates the poem to the time of [Moschus] 3 and thus the generation of Bion's students. On further research since Gow (1952) cf. Köhnken (1999) 41–42.

¹⁴ The points raised against its authenticity include the lack of ancient attestation (e.g. in the form of papyri) and the (overall not particularly noticeable) deviations from Theocritus' linguistic usage. In addition to attributions to Moschus and Bion, several syntactic and prosodic peculiarities have also led to a suggested date of creation in pre-Nonnian imperial times (Gow (1952) vol. 2, 484; on research after Gow (1952) cf. Köhnken (1999) 62–63). Yet, in a renewed inquiry, Sider (2001) 99–100 has shown that those indications cited as points against the poem's authenticity are of cumulative force at best.

¹⁵ Cf. Sider (2001).

him into the woods to see his sleeping-place. Here they make love; her resistance now appears feigned. At the end, the narrator stresses the pleasure that both of them drew from the experience. The final couplet, whose meaning is unclear and which is transmitted in varying forms, shows that a narrator had retold the preceding dialogue to a shepherd.¹⁶ The most important Theocritean model is *Id.* 3, l. 20 of which is quoted verbatim at *Id.* 27.4.

[Moschus] 3 (*Epitaph for Bion*):¹⁷ a pupil's dirge for Bion, who is represented as a singer. The most important models are Theocr. *Id.* 1, the Bionean *Epitaph for Adonis* as well as several other poems of Bion.

Bion, fragments: in a clearly pastoral setting we find fr. 2 (an eighteen-line dialogue of two herdsmen concerning the question of which is the best season of the year), as well as frs. 5, 9, 10 and 11 (between 3 and 13 lines); fr. 16 (to which [Moschus] 3.58–63 apparently alludes) tells of Polyphemus wooing Galatea (models: Theocr. *Id.* 6 and 11).

[Bion] 2 (*Epithalamios for Achilles and Deidameia*):¹⁸ only the beginning of this poem survives. In a bucolic dialogue (1–9), Myrson asks Lycidas to sing an erotic song on Achilles' love for Deidameia "as Polyphemus once did for Galatea" (3–4). In the remaining verses, Lycidas tells the beginning of that story. The most important Theocritean models are *Id.* 1 (the invitation to a herdsman to sing a song) and *Id.* 11 (eroticisation of a warlike figure from Homer).¹⁹

For a long time, research into post-Theocritean bucolic poetry was dominated by questions concerning authenticity, mainly of course in relation to the ps.-Theocritea. Another focus lay on the question of how one might be able to reconstruct a history of the genre in the time between the two giants, Theocritus and Virgil, on the basis of these poems. Often, both approaches were too much concerned with the dif-

¹⁶ On other possible but less plausible interpretations cf. Gow (1952) on *Id.* 27.72–73.

¹⁷ The attribution to Moschus that we find in several mss. is chronologically impossible and was corrected in the 19th century. Bion's death is the *terminus post quem*, Catullus the *terminus ante quem* (his poem 5.5–6 imitates ll. 103–104 of the *Epitaph*), the text is thus probably to be dated to the first half of the 1st century BC (according to Bücheler (1875) 40–41, to the time of Sulla).

¹⁸ While Triclinius wanted to attribute the anonymously transmitted poem to Theocritus, Orsini (1568) thought it was composed by Bion, an attribution followed by later scholars. Indeed there are no linguistic, metrical or content-related features that speak against Bion's authorship, even though Reed (1997) 29 thinks that a rather primitive line of thought like the one displayed in this piece would not appear in Bion. The late date assigned by Matthews (1994) 34 is based on the assumption of dependence on other post-Theocritean bucolic poems, particularly the *Epitaph for Bion*. However, in my view, there can be no certainty about such dependence.

¹⁹ Marked by the comparison of the following song with that of Polyphemus for Galatea in ll. 1–3, cf. Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 176, n. 152.

ferences between this poetry and that of Theocritus, and clearly considered these ‘epigones’ as inferior to the ‘classic’. As an example from recent times one can mention Ernst A. Schmidt, who applies Ernst R. Curtius’ verdict (taken from a different context) of a “Traditionskette der Mittelmäßigkeit” to post-Theocritean bucolic poetry.²⁰

Only in more recent times have there been attempts at broadening this narrow perspective and understanding single poems as original works of art,²¹ or—going beyond all questions of authenticity or tastes which have changed over time—at asking in what ways Theocritean and other models are being creatively reshaped. A good example of this can be found in the study of the elegiac couplets in *Id.* 8, which had previously only been looked at with a view to deciding whether they represent an indication of the poem’s inauthenticity. Only recently did Luigi Enrico Rossi interpret the choice of elegiac metre in *Id.* 8 as a further development of the strophic organisation of pastoral poems that is already discernible in Theocritus.²² These recent developments shall be taken into account here, and the heterogeneity of the corpus—to be expected given the variety of authors and dates of creation—will be revealed as the single texts are being taken more and more seriously. Current research on Theocritus has furthermore been increasingly revealing the heterogeneity of his work; these findings, too, will preclude the employment of over-simplified literary categories.

The texts under consideration here also deserve special attention in as far as they, next to the remaining texts from the bucolic manuscripts (e.g. Moschus’ epyllion *Europa*), represent some of the little remaining evidence of Hellenistic poetry after the great Alexandrian poets from the first half of the 3rd century BC: with the exception of epigram (and, if we date him to the 2nd century BC, Lycophron), the poetry of this ‘dark age’ within Hellenism only survives in fragments.²³ Consequently it is rather difficult to place this bucolic poetry in the context

²⁰ Schmidt (1972) 70, Schmidt (1987) 105, at the beginning of an analysis of *Id.* 8, the only work in post-Theocritean bucolic poetry that he considers to be “auf Grund seiner Qualität und seines Charakters wirklich interessant”.

²¹ Sider’s (2001) treatment of *Id.* 27 can be seen as a successful example of such a self-contained interpretation.

²² Rossi (2000) 245–246.

²³ From this period (and on the questionable assumption that it is to be dated to the 2nd century) we also have Lycophron’s *Alexandra* but probably not the didactic poems of Nicander, which according to Cameron (1995) 194–205 are likely to have been written by a contemporary of Aratus. A good overview of the period’s literary production can be found in Lightfoot (1999) 17–31.

of any literary currents. For the 3rd century BC, however, we can at least refer to the revival of the satyr play,²⁴ which with characters such as Polyphemus (Euripides) and Daphnis (Sositheus) and with its combination of the sublime and the comical reveals a certain proximity to bucolic poetry.²⁵

2. *Formal aspects*

Most of Theocritus' pastoral poems are purely mimetic and usually in the form of a dialogue with two or three speakers (*Id.* 1, 4, 5, 10);²⁶ a monologue is found only once (*Id.* 3).²⁷ It is less usual to have poems within a narrative frame, namely in the two Polyphemus poems (6 and 11) which contain an extradiegetic narrator (i.e. one who is not actively involved in the story told) who is to be identified with the poet himself. A special role is played by the famous *Id.* 7 whose narrator, Simichidas, is intradiegetic and thus tells of events in which he himself participated. Not only because Simichidas presents himself as a bucolic singer (ll. 30–31; 91–95) can we identify him with Theocritus himself—an identification apparently considered self-evident by ancient commentators.²⁸

The pure dialogue form dominant in Theocritus loses in importance among his successors. Apart from Bion's fr. 2,²⁹ the only undisputable example is the dialogue between two herdsmen at [Bion] 2. Nevertheless here, too, the mimetic character of the piece is backgrounded by the fact that the dialogical framework only serves as an introduction to what appears to be a rather long mythical narration. Apart from its referring to Paris as ὁ βοῦκόλος (l. 10), the content of this tale does not contain any recognisably bucolic features.³⁰ We find a general model for

²⁴ Hunter in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 436–437.

²⁵ Cf. Bernsdorff (1999) 82 and Di Marco, this volume, p. 480; especially on the classification of the Bionean *Epitaph for Adonis* cf. Fantuzzi (1985) 152–165, who associates its strongly mimetic character with the flourishing of mime in the 3rd and 2nd century.

²⁶ Among the non-pastoral ones *Id.* 14 and 15.

²⁷ Among the non-pastoral poems *Id.* 2.

²⁸ Many modern scholars agree with this; yet in addition to the analogies between Theocritus and Simichidas we also need to note the distance with which this figure is depicted in *Id.* 7, cf. most recently Nickau (2002a) 396–398.

²⁹ If it has been transmitted in its entirety; on the framework of *Id.* 27 see below pp. 175–176.

³⁰ Arland (1937) 53.

this in the song of Thyrsis in *Id.* 1 on the death of Daphnis; here, however, the dirge-like character is strongly noticeable, not least because of the use of refrain verses. All other examples present us either with a dialogue within a narrative framework, or with a monologue.

In [Theocr.] *Id.* 8 a narrator who is not further described introduces the dialogue of two herdsmen, thus following the model of Theocr. *Id.* 6. This poem does, however, also relate the conversation preceding their songs, a method also found in the purely mimetic idylls of Theocritus (1, 5, 10).

Regarding its narrative technique, *Id.* 9 can almost be described as bold. It starts by asking Daphnis to sing a song, and Menalcas to follow this song with another. Only in the verse that bridges the two songs (l. 14), however, does it become clear that he who had asked the herdsmen to sing is only *telling of*³¹ their encounter. After Menalcas' song, the narrator reports how he rewarded Daphnis with a crook and Menalcas with a conch-shell horn, and subsequently, in a kind of internal proem (ll. 28–30), relates the song which he himself had sung in the presence of the two herdsmen.

While this structure cannot be found anywhere else in the Theocritean corpus, it can be explained as a combination of several of Theocritus' *Idylls*. In its overall shape, the threefold constellation of two herdsmen and one 'judge'³² is provided by *Id.* 5. The idea of having the judge sing a song himself probably stems from *Id.* 7: here Lycidas sings himself, but in his handing over the *κορύνα* (*Id.* 7.43 and 128) to Simichidas also recognises the skilful achievement of the latter—an act which doubtlessly represents the model of Daphnis' receiving his reward at *Id.* 9.22–23.³³ The model, however, for the first-person narrator who from a temporal distance tells of songs that include his own is provided by Simichidas in *Id.* 7 (together with *Id.* 9.29 *ποκ'*), cf. *Id.* 7.1 *Ἦς χρόνος ἀνίκ' ἐγών* ...).³⁴ Given the considerations just outlined, the

³¹ Σ in POxy. 3548, fr. 43, however, considers it necessary to point out that it is the poet who speaks from 22 onwards. At *Ecl.* 7.6 (i.e. much earlier in the poem), Virgil employs a similar "departure from the normal impersonal mode of narration", cf. Coleman (1977) *ad loc.* A radical use of a similar technique (perhaps following Archil. *IEG* 19) is found in *Epode* 2, where Horace does not indicate until the end of the poem that the preceding praise of the rural life has come from the mouth of the *fenerator Alfius*.

³² A term which of course applies to *Id.* 9 only with reservations, given that the competitive situation has mostly faded.

³³ Arland (1937) 24.

³⁴ Although a difference can be seen in the fact that the narrative role of the speaker of *Id.* 9.1–6 remains unclear until l. 14, and that the songs of the two herdsmen are sung

first-person narrator of *Id.* 9 seems to combine the two main characters of *Id.* 7. As he presents himself both as a friend of the Muses and as a poet, he can easily be identified with the author of the poem. This continues a tendency that has its origins in *Id.* 7 and becomes very popular in post-Theocritean bucolic poetry in general.

A further remarkable combination, that of the intradiegetic first-person narrative as found in *Id.* 7 and the mimetic monologue of *Id.* 3 (which is also similar in terms of the constellation of persons involved), can be found in *Id.* 20. The narrator first of all *reports* (ll. 1–18) the words with which the proud Eunice rejected him, and what she then did that thus caused him to feel the anger because of which he subsequently (from l. 19) addresses his speech to the ποιμένες. In a monologue he then praises his own qualities and gives examples of herdsmen loved by the gods, thus remaining very close to *Id.* 3 also in the content of his words.

The beginning of *Id.* 27 is evidently corrupt. If we were to reconstruct it on the basis of the ending, we might expect a counterpart to ll. 72–73³⁵ in the form of a monologic-mimetic opening passage in which the narrator of what follows is speaking. Perhaps the speaker was the shepherd who is addressed in the ending, which would have thus provided a mimetic-dialogic framework for the poem. The uncertainties related to the last two verses, however, allow only speculation in this matter. Corresponding to ll. 67–71b, we furthermore would have to expect an introduction by the narrator which contained the main part, the stichomythia, and whose beginning is also lost. In spite of the probably mimetic frame, the narrative element is very prominent in this poem. Among the bucolic poems of Theocritus, the model for the stichomythia is probably to be found in *Id.* 4 where, however, it is presented mimetically; the model for a dialogue recounted within a narrative passage is *Id.* 6, but while that recounts fairly long songs, in *Id.* 27 we find—in an oddly tense relation to its subject—“Wechselrede in ihrer lebhaftesten Form”.³⁶ A model for stichomythia

in a setting different from that recited to them by the narrator and judge (at least if ποικίλ is correctly transmitted, cf. above n. 12).

³⁵ This pair of verses, however, is not transmitted in all the sources, and is furthermore unclear as to its exact meaning. Some interpreters want to see it as a separate subscription to the poem.

³⁶ Arland (1937) 61. If Arland, however, considers the use of stichomythia here as a deviation from the ‘receding of mime’ otherwise observable in post-Theocritean bucolic poetry, he neglects the fact that this stichomythia is part of a narrative.

inserted into a narrative passage can only be found in a non-bucolic poem of Theocritus.³⁷

The preference for monologue, finally, is evident in [Moschus] 3, the *Epitaph for Bion*: like its most important model, the Bionean *Epitaph for Adonis*, it basically takes the lament, structured by means of a refrain, of the herdsman Thyrsis over the dead Daphnis out of its dialogic context and isolates it as a monologue. Immediately following the model of the song of Thyrsis and ignoring the *Epitaph for Adonis*, the speaker appears as a herdsman poet (cf. ll. 93–97).³⁸

Two important tendencies can be established from these observations: Hellenistic bucolic poetry after Theocritus on the one hand does without the purely mimetic-dialogic form dominant in the latter, and thus also without the lively immediacy linked to this. We still encounter dialogues, which however are moved into a ‘safe distance’ from the audience by means of a narrator (a trait, by the way, not continued by Virgil, who at least gives four of his ten *Eclogues* a mimetic-dialogic shape: *Ecl.* 1, 3, 5, 9). On the other hand, choice not only of monologic form but also of an identified first-person narrator gives these bucolic poems the character of subjective poetry in which an “I” is speaking that can be identified with the poet himself.³⁹ In as far as this “I” is suffering from matters of love (as in *Id.* 20, partic. ll. 15–16, and Bion fr. 9, partic. 7) we can see a clear proximity to the subjective love elegy of the Romans.⁴⁰ If the “I” is a herdsman, or at least linked to the

³⁷ *Id.* 22.54–74; Wilamowitz (1906) 92, n. 1.

³⁸ The receding of the dialogic-mimetic form in favour of narrative and monologue can also be found in those fragments attributed to Moschus and Bion (with the exception of Bion fr. 2) which are, with a relative degree of certainty, transmitted as a whole (taking into account also the fragments of non-pastoral content). For these consist either of third-person narrative (Bion fr. 13 on a bird-catcher; thus non-pastoral; this does not have a model in Theocritus) or a first-person account by an intradiegetic narrator (Bion fr. 10), as *Id.* 7, or they are to be seen as monologic utterances (Bion fr. 9, Moschus 1). As far as the remaining fragments are at all long enough to even assume a categorisation, there seems to be a predominance of monologue. Only Bion fr. 2 is dialogic-mimetic in its transmitted form; the existence of a narrative frame as in *Id.* 6 can however not be excluded. In the short fragments 5 and 6, an interlocutor is being addressed; but an assumption, like that of Arland (1937) 51, of a mimetic-dialogical character of the piece overall seems most uncertain to me.

³⁹ The Theocritean models of these two methods are *Id.* 3 (monologue) and *Id.* 7 (identified first-person narrator). Particularly in these cases, ancient scholarship identified the narrator with Theocritus, cf. Σ *Id.* 3.8–9 and the introductory Σ *Id.* 7. On *Id.* 9.28–30 (invocation of the Muses by the first-person narrator, as an introduction to his own song) the scholia note ταῦτα ὁ νομεὺς ἢ Θεόκριτος λέγει.

⁴⁰ Cf. below p. 201, with n. 158.

world of herdsmen, the author of the poem appears as a herdsman himself. This has already been found in Theocritus in as far as there, too, the herdsmen are singers and thus also ‘poets’, declaiming hexameters just as much as the ‘author’ of the whole bucolic poem.⁴¹ We furthermore saw that the monologue in *Id.* 3 makes the identification of the speaker with Theocritus himself at least possible, and thus even seems to provoke the identification of Theocritus with Simichidas, the first-person narrator in *Id.* 7. Remarkably, however, it is just Simichidas who, although he refers to himself as a bucolic singer (ll. 30–31; 91–95), appears as an urban intruder into the world of herdsmen.⁴² In the remainder of Theocritus’ pastoral poetry, the author and his addressee are either clearly separated from the world of herdsmen (through the addressing of Aratus and Nicias in the Polyphemus poems *Id.* 6 and 11) or they do not appear at all (in the purely mimetic-dialogic poems). Thus, the distance between the portrayed world of herdsmen on the one hand and the author and his audience on the other, which is overall maintained in Theocritus, is not continued by his successors, who either prefer the form of monologue (*Id.* 20; possibly *Id.* 27) or, as in *Id.* 9, have an intradiegetic narrator (probably a herdsman himself) tell of his participation in a pastoral agon.⁴³

Unless the tradition deceives us, the portrayal of the bucolic poet as a herdsman is particularly clear in the fragments of Bion, especially as the “I” here often reflects on its own poetry (fr. 9; 10; not the pastoral fr. 8).⁴⁴ The author of the *Epitaph for Bion* (= [Moschus] 3) continues this line by explicitly portraying his deceased master as a

⁴¹ On this fact see Schmidt (1972) 45; one should bear in mind that Hesiod receives his “Musenweihe” while guarding sheep (*Theog.* 23 and 26). The theogony following upon this is of course not presented as a song of the shepherd Hesiod.

⁴² Hunter (1999) 146, Nickau (2002a) 391.

⁴³ How the reduction of this distance is effected also by the increase in eroticism has been accurately described by Reed (1997) 9 in view of Bion fr. 11: “Bion de-emphasises the features that differentiate him [i.e. the speaker of fr. 11] from Bion’s readers and emphasises the role which all can identify, that of the romantic lover”.

⁴⁴ It should be noted, however, that the relative frequency of fragments of poetological content may also be the result of Stobaeus’ gnomological interests. A further example of the depiction of the bucolic poet as a herdsman can be found in the *Syrinx* transmitted under Theocritus’ name, a *technopaionion* which pretends to be an inscription by a Πάρις ... Σιμυχίδας (i.e. Theocritus, cf. Σ ll. 11 and 12) on a *syrinx* dedicated to Pan. Theocritus here also appears as a herdsman because he is dedicating an instrument typical of this profession. On this poem most recently Nickau (2002a) 398–401 who does not consider the evidence brought against the authenticity of this poem as convincing and sees the poem as “Theokrits nicht ganz unwürdig” (401).

herdsman who carries out those activities about which he had sung in his poems (80–84).⁴⁵ By mourning a herdsman and a poet, the author of [Moschus] 3 passes over his model, the Bionean *Epitaph for Adonis*, in which Adonis appears neither as a herdsman nor a poet,⁴⁶ and returns to the song of Thyrsis, which mourns Daphnis as the mythical predecessor of all herdsmen singers. The novelty of the *Epitaph for Bion* lies in the replacement of Daphnis by a real contemporary poet.⁴⁷

The formal openness of post-Theocritean bucolic poetry revealed so far is nowhere clearer than where the poet presents the first half of the agon of herdsmen (*Id.* 8.33–60) in elegiac couplets.⁴⁸ The consequences of this metrical extension are considerable: because at least parts of the pastoral songs recounted in the poem are given a different metrical shape, the overarching unity, which otherwise is a fundamental characteristic of bucolic poetry, is destroyed: in principle, a bucolic idyll belongs to the same genre of fictitiously sung hexameters as the pastoral songs which it contains.⁴⁹ In the history of the genre, this is an important prerequisite for the high degree of self-reflexivity that we find. It is perhaps due to this fact that, as far as we can see, this experimental metric extension is not taken up again in the later history of the genre. In a kind of classicistic counter-strike, Virgil's seventh *Eclogue* takes up the elegiac couplets of *Id.* 8, but turns them back into hexameters.⁵⁰

The use of the elegiac couplet in *Id.* 8 may have been inspired by Hermesianax who, according to the scholia on *Id.* 8.53–56, probably used the form of elegy to sing about Daphnis' love for Menalcas.⁵¹

⁴⁵ On which cf. Schmidt (1972) 87.

⁴⁶ Although Adonis can be portrayed as a herdsman elsewhere, Reed (1997) on *Epitaph for Adonis* 7.

⁴⁷ The Gallus of *Ecl.* 10 is clearly modelled after the Daphnis of *Id.* 1. The model for the replacement of a mythical by a real poet will probably have been provided by the *Epitaph for Bion*.

⁴⁸ On this most recently Rossi (2000) 245–254, who considers the use of an elegiac couplet to establish a strophic structure as a violation of the economic principle which, as he says, can be recognised in the genuinely Theocritean poems (p. 249).

⁴⁹ Schmidt (1972) 45.

⁵⁰ Especially *Ecl.* 7.45–61, cf. Posch (1969) 21, Coleman (1977) 226.

⁵¹ According to Σ *Id.* 9 *arg.* also the unhappy love of Menalcas for Euippe. In the genuine poems by Theocritus, on the other hand, Menalcas is not being mentioned, cf. Perrotta (1925) 315–320. Hubbard's (1998), 35 identification of Menalcas with the elegiac poetry of Hermesianax and of Daphnis with the hexametric poetry of Theocritus, as well as his interpretation of the parallel use of both metres in *Id.* 8 as a "competition of genres" based on this, does not seem convincing to me: Σ [Theocr.] *Id.* 8.53–56 says that Hermesianax sang not only about Menalcas, but also about Daphnis; furthermore

But even if we accept this impulse, the epigrammatic character of the elegiac couplets in *Id.* 8 nevertheless remains undisputable.⁵² The integration of epigrams into a bucolic idyll probably reflects not only a flourishing of the former genre in the Hellenistic period (a genre which unlike no other outside bucolic poetry has concerned itself with pastoral issues).⁵³ It has also been made possible by a series of similarities between the two genres, and implicitly focuses on these: the metre takes up the couplet structure of Theocritean pastoral songs, which in Theocritus is effected by different means (syntax, assignment of speaking parts), makes it materialise on the metrical level and thus emphasises it. In this way it becomes evident that both pastoral song and epigram need to obey the principle of variation, albeit in different ways: the author of *Id.* 8 shows clearly that a herdsman who has to vary and at the same time outdo the song of another is faced by the same task as a writer of epigrams. In no other poetic genre is the principle of variation as evident as in epigram, a fact that can be, at least partly, put down to their playful use at symposia from the 4th century BC onwards.⁵⁴ The similarity between a symposium and the leisure of herdsmen that is spent on song does of course facilitate this opening of the genre. The presentation of pairs of epigrams in the amoebean song of *Id.* 8 could furthermore reflect the tendency of forming 'companion-pieces' that can be observed in Hellenistic epigrams.⁵⁵

A similar awareness of formal matters in *Id.* 8 is also visible in another respect: the poet aims at realising the principle of analogy, which because of the central role of amoebean song can be seen as typical of bucolic poetry,⁵⁶ with particular formal and content-related acuteness both within (e.g. ll. 32–40) and outside of (cf. the ἀμφο

it is not possible to see from this idyll that the elegiac couplets should be identified more strongly with Menalcas, and the hexameters with Daphnis. Accordingly, we have to reject the interpretation of Hubbard (1998) 36–37, according to which *Id.* 9 would be a programmatic avowal to Theocritus (= Daphnis) and Hermesianax (= Menalcas).

⁵² Cf. Perrotta (1925) 316–317 and Bernsdorff (2001) 93.

⁵³ Bernsdorff (2001) 91–180. On the other hand, there are a few (hexameter) fragments of Bion that also display a certain proximity to epigrammatic poetry both in their form and their motifs, cf. Reed (1997) 11–12.

⁵⁴ On this, cf. Ludwig (1968) 300–301.

⁵⁵ Kirstein (2002).

⁵⁶ A curious extension of the amoebean principle is provided by the author of [Moschus] 3, who has nightingales and swallows, both of which had been taught by Bion, mourn in amoebean song (48 ὑπεφώνεον), cf. Mumprecht (1964) *ad loc.*

anaphora in the introductory ll. 3–4) the amoebean song.⁵⁷ It is from this tendency that we can also explain the particular fondness for the priamel in *Id.* 8,⁵⁸ a form which, not at least because of the opening of *Id.* 1, is to be seen as particularly bucolic.⁵⁹

It can finally not surprise that we find particularly long antiphonic passages in this idyll which are furthermore twice referred to by the technical-sounding term ἀμειβάτος,⁶⁰ which simultaneously refers to the description of the Muses by Homer in *Il.* 1.604 (ἄειδον ἀμειβόμεναι ὅππῃ καλῇ) and thus alludes to divine legitimation.⁶¹

3. *Representation of the world of herdsmen*

Several of Theocritus' poems, particularly *Id.* 5, are characterised by a 'realistic' depiction of the herdsmen and their world that does not omit unpleasant and unwelcome aspects.⁶² Among Theocritus' successors, this perspective clearly loses in importance.⁶³ In *Id.* 8 Menalcas has to move⁶⁴ Milon to love a herdsman by using a mythical example—namely that of Proteus, the divine guardian of the notoriously smelly

⁵⁷ "Die Genauigkeit der Responson" is emphasised also by Arland (1937) 20 together with other accurate observations on related formal features in *Id.* 8.

⁵⁸ *Id.* 8.57–60, 79–80, at the end of each singing contest; observed by Arland (1937) 18, with reference to the conscious ordering of the single elements according to contents which, according to him, do not occur in Theocritus. At ll. 31–36 the author of *Id.* 9 employs the form of the priamel twice in a row.

⁵⁹ Cf. Gow's (1952) material *ad loc.*, Bernsdorff (1996) 77–78, Reed (1997) 189.

⁶⁰ *Id.* 8.31 and 61; otherwise not in the corpus ascribed to Theocritus (cf. Gow (1952) on *Id.* 8.31–32). On its technical usage cf. LSJ s.v., II, with reference to Plato, *Resp.* 394b3–4 concerning dialogue in relation to narrative, and Plut. *Pomp.* 48 concerning responson in choral odes.

⁶¹ Demonstrated by Virgil in a passage which emphasises the amoebean technique with similar explicitness (*Ecl.* 3.58–59): *incipi, Damoeta; tu deinde sequere, Menalca / alternis dicetis; amant alterna Camenae*; similarly *Ecl.* 7.5 and 18–20; cf. Coleman (1977) on *Ecl.* 3, 59.

⁶² I here employ the term "realistic" which has become common in scholarship on bucolic poetry, even though this causes some theoretical problems mainly due to the fact that the depiction of the harshness of rural life had, of course, already appeared in earlier literature (e.g. in Hesiod) and did not spring immediately from Theocritus' poetic vision alone, cf. Schmidt (1987) 108, Hunter (1999) 200.

⁶³ We should, however, refer to *Id.* 21, in which the poverty of the fishermen is being described by the narrator (this is un-Theocritean, cf. Gow (1952) vol. 2, 370) with particular vividness, similar to the later ps.-Virgilian *Moretum*.

⁶⁴ This topos that appears already in Theocritus (*Id.* 3.40–51) is continued by his successors, cf. also *Id.* 20.34–41, Longus 3.34.2; 4.17.6–7.

seals—even though Milon belongs to the rural sphere himself; this unpleasant trait, however, is directly expressed neither on the level of the *illustrans* nor that of the *illustrandum*. The stench of a herdsman is explicitly mentioned in the rejecting words of Eunice at *Id.* 20.10, but we cannot be sure whether this is due to urban squeamishness, especially as the herdsman himself seems to be convinced of his own beauty (ll. 19–32).⁶⁵ This, however, is only a weak reflection of Theocritean realism.

In spite of the remaining importance of eroticism in general, the representation of rough human and animal sexuality, which in Theocritus' pastoral poems often forms the antithesis to the tender forms of love sung about by the herdsman and which thus fulfils an important contrasting function, is also diminished.⁶⁶ Indicative of this is Eunice's warning at *Id.* 20, pronounced after a description of the ugliness and particularly the bad smell of the herdsman, that he should not stain her with his advances (*Id.* 20.10 b): ἀπ' ἐμεῦ φύγε μή με μολύνῃς, "away, lest you defile me". The verb μολύνειν is found in only one other location in the Theocritean corpus (*Id.* 5.87b), a passage in which Lacon describes his sexual activities: τὸν ἄναβον ἐν ἄνθεσι παῖδα μολύνει, "and he debauches a beardless boy in the shrubbery".⁶⁷ Although an erotic context is present also in *Id.* 20, the author there returns to the otherwise common meaning of μολύνειν, "to stain". Theocritus' successors usually depict the everyday life of herdsmen as one spent in pleasant leisure, e.g. in the songs of *Id.* 9, which are programmatically opened by a ἀδύ metaphor (ll. 7–8) reminiscent of the opening of *Id.* 1. It is to be noted that the natural threats facing herdsmen are still found here. But the wearisome heat of summer or the cold of winter are only being referred to in order to emphasise that one is safe from them; and even when the southwest wind seized Daphnis' cattle and threw them off a cliff, it gave the herdsman beautiful hides that now provide him with a soft bed (ll. 9–11).

The praise of one's present location is found already in Theocritus. The *locus classicus* are those verses with which, in *Id.* 5, Lacon and Comatas are quarrelling about the place in which they will carry out their contest (ll. 31–34, 45–61). Here, praising one's current location thus clearly is part of a strategy of persuasion; similarly at *Id.* 11.42–

⁶⁵ On this question, cf. also below p. 185.

⁶⁶ Stanzel (1995) 82–88, Bernsdorff (2001) 158.

⁶⁷ Cf. Σ *ad loc.*: μολύνει ἀντὶ τοῦ βινεῖ.

48, where Polyphemus wants to convince Galatea of the advantages of living on land together with him. In *Id.* 9, on the other hand, which hardly allows us to see any kind of competition between the two herdsmen, the praise of one's current location has become an arbitrary topic of bucolic singers that does not serve any further purpose. It is not surprising that the inhabitants of such a world are perfectly happy as long as they have their beloved at their side while guarding their flock. Thus we find Menalcas at *Id.* 8.53–56 refusing, e.g., Croesus' riches if only he can look at the sea with his beloved in his arms (a statement made with a perception of nature not encountered in Theocritus)⁶⁸ and can sing bucolic songs.

The glorification of one's own existence then finds its zenith in *Id.* 9 when Menalcas remarks that he has as many sheep and goats 'as appear to him in his dreams' (ll. 16–17). In this world, the dream which normally aims at the impossible has become a reality. It is also telling that in l. 18 this multitude of animals is being noted—of course as a parallel to Daphnis' soft cowhides in ll. 9–10—for their soft furs on which Menalcas will be able to lay down his head and feet. In *Id.* 11, on the other hand, which we will see *Id.* 9 referring to in several ways, Polyphemus says at ll. 22–23 that Galatea comes to him when he is asleep and leaves again when he wakes up. Thus he reveals that his dreams, unlike in *Id.* 9, are wishful thinking and of an erotic nature, and as such relate to an area which, as will yet become clear, does not seem to interest the herdsmen of *Id.* 9. At *Id.* 10.32–35, the reaper Bucaeus had wished to possess Croesus' riches so that he, like a Hellenistic monarch,⁶⁹ could have erected a golden statue of himself and his beloved. In his imagination, Bucaeus thus leaves the rural sphere,

⁶⁸ *Id.* 8.55–56: ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τᾷ πέτρᾳ τᾷδ' ἔσομαι ἀγκὰς ἔχων τυ / σύννομα μῆλ' ἐσορῶν τὰν Σικελίαν ἐς ἄλᾱ, "beneath this rock will I sit and sing with you in my arms and watch my grazing flocks and the Sicilian sea". An emendation of the transmitted wording, as suggested by Gow, is not necessary if we see σύννομα μῆλ' as object of ἔσομαι, cf. Renahan (1965): Menalcas expresses the wish to be able to do what he is about to do at ll. 63–70 (to sing of his sheep) also in the future—but then with Milon in his arms. His gazing at the sea is taken over from *Id.* 11.17–18 where, however, it possesses a clear function: Polyphemus looks at the habitat of his beloved, to whom the song that follows is addressed (Arland (1937) 17–18). In *Id.* 8, however, it mainly seems to be the beauty of the view that motivates Menalcas' gazing at the sea (on the change in perception of landscape cf. Schmidt (1972) 77). Fantuzzi (1998) 71–72 explains the maritime scenery of *Id.* 8 also with reference to the fact that the role-playing of Daphnis and Damoetas in *Id.* 6, which served as the model for *Id.* 8, also needs to be seen as taking place close to the sea.

⁶⁹ Hunter (1999) on *Id.* 10.33.

while Menalcas sees his dreams realised in his own natural surroundings. In the songs of *Id.* 8 we also find the herdsmen adorning their world with fabulous characteristics: to give thanks for their song, nature should provide the herdsmen's flocks with copious nourishment (ll. 33–40). Although these may just be wishes, their fulfilment is not seen as impossible. And continuing in the indicative: nature blossoms in those places where a herdsman's beloved appears (ll. 41–48).⁷⁰

The impression of a less realistic representation is supported by the fact that overall we find far fewer details. Even where these are indicated, they remain vague or even reveal ignorance of the matters depicted. Thus, in his imitation of *Id.* 5, the author of *Id.* 8 attempts to portray a herdsman's song as it could take place in real life, but reveals in several places that he, unlike Theocritus, has not understood how such a singing contest works, e.g. when he has the contestants set unequal prizes or when the question of who has been defeated is decided through an aesthetic judgement on the part of the judge rather than because one contestant has been 'outsung'.⁷¹ In *Id.* 9, too, we find factual weaknesses, so e.g. when in l. 3 both herdsmen appear to be cowherds, but Menalcas in ll. 17–18 a shepherd and goatherd.⁷² Many aspects remain unclear, as e.g. when we compare the appointing of a judge at *Id.* 8.25–27 with the exemplary *Id.* 5 (ll. 60–73)⁷³ or contrast the ἄδύ anaphora with which Daphnis introduces his song at *Id.* 9.7–8 with its model, the opening of *Id.* 1. In Theocritus, various acoustic aspects of the *locus amoenus* that surrounds the herdsmen are combined in a consistent manner and, in the fashion of a priamel, contrasted to the melody of the *syrix* played by the herdsman in these surroundings. In *Id.* 9, on the other hand, the final element ἄδὺ δὲ κῆγών (l. 8) also aims at a priamel, but inappropriately the two preceding elements also come from the area of human art, and the two animal sounds described in l. 7 do not communicate a very vivid picture.

In spite of the new perception of nature that we saw above in the sea-view at *Id.* 8.56, we have to note a decrease in detail and

⁷⁰ Cf. Fantuzzi (1998) 73, who sees these traits as taken from the mythical world of herdsmen evoked by the song of Thyrsis. On the use of the pathetic fallacy cf. below, pp. 196–197.

⁷¹ Merkelbach (1956) 233–238. It needs to be pointed out, of course, that Theocritus apparently wants to follow the rules of such real singing contests only in *Id.* 5. *Idd.* 1, 6 and 7 are conscious variations of the popular form, cf. Merkelbach (1956) 231–233.

⁷² A detailed discussion of further shortcomings at Gow (1952) on *Id.* 9.3 and 11.

⁷³ Arland (1937) 16–17.

vividness also in descriptions of nature. While the introduction to *Id.* 6, in spite of its brevity, succeeds in painting a picture of a mid-day scene at a spring, the opening of *Id.* 8 modelled on this only includes κατ' ὄρεα, "upon the hills" (l. 2). Following the model of *Id.* 7, the mountains have apparently become the bucolic habitat *par excellence*.⁷⁴ But while it is particularly in *Id.* 7 that we find especially vivid and detailed descriptions of nature, post-Theocritean bucolic poetry often employs ὄρεος with a local preposition only as a template-like indication of bucolic locality. In addition to the opening of *Id.* 8 we have to mention *Id.* 20, which seems to have a particular predilection for this expression.⁷⁵

In respect to the outward appearance of the herdsmen we find similar tendencies: if we compare, again, the beginning of *Id.* 8 with *Id.* 6 under this new aspect, we find that attributes which refer only to youthfulness (ll. 2–3 ὁ μὲν ... πυρρός, ὁ δ' ἡμιγένειος, "half-bearded the one, the other's chin ruddy with down") are being replaced by a description of Daphnis as χαρίεις, "fair" (*Id.* 8.1), a term which judges on the basis of looks while at the same time not being very expressive. It is telling that elsewhere in the corpus of Theocritus' works this adjective is used for herdsmen only one more time at *Id.* 20.18.⁷⁶ We arrive at a similar picture in relation to the use of καλός: to describe the beauty of male herdsmen it is only employed in *Id.* 8 and 20.⁷⁷ At *Id.* 7.132 Amyntas, one of the companions and probably the *eromenos* of Simichidas, is described as καλός; both of them probably come from the urban sphere. When the judge at *Id.* 1.146 describes the mouth of Thyrsis after he has just sung as καλόν, this first and foremost refers to the quality of what this mouth has just uttered. Only at *Id.* 6.36 does Polyphemos say that his beard and his one eye appear beautiful to him; but as we know, Polyphemos' disturbed self-perception is exactly what is being addressed in *Id.* 6.19.

While the outward appearance of Daphnis at *Id.* 8.1 is described by the narrator and this description may thus claim objective validity, the instances from *Id.* 20 are found in the monologue of the herdsman who, in view of his rejection by the urban Eunice, stresses his own beauty.

⁷⁴ For such description of place in *Id.* 7.46, 51, 56–57, 74, cf. Schmidt (1972) 90–91.

⁷⁵ Line 35; at 30 and 45 in antithesis to ἐν ἄσπεϊ, cf. Bernsdorff (1999) on l. 14.

⁷⁶ Sometimes it is used also of the female beloveds of Theocritean shepherds.

⁷⁷ *Id.* 8.47, 51, 73; 20.19, 30, cf. also, with a similarly template character as at *Id.* 8.1 and [Moschus] 3.7 καλὸς τέθνακε μελικτὰς (said of Bion).

Here, the beauty of herdsmen is depicted as problematic and integrated into the contrast between city and countryside which here replaces the contrast between land and sea, which in turn dominates Theocritus' Polyphemus poems that serve as an example here.⁷⁸ In this context it is remarkable that the herdsmen compares his beauty to elements of the rural sphere⁷⁹ (22–27), asks his fellow herdsmen to serve as witnesses for his beauty (19) and refers to his popularity among women (30). Nevertheless it remains open whether it is him or Eunica who is right concerning the judgement of his looks, while the self-assessments of Theocritean herdsmen in similar situations do not leave any doubts as to their ugliness.⁸⁰

Compared to Theocritus, the world of herdsmen also loses some of its rawness through the fact that children appear as main characters (compare *Id.* 8.3 ἀμφὼ ἀνάβω, “both were striplings” to the attributes of πρῶτος and ἡμιγένειος describing the youths at *Id.* 6.3) which fear their parents and make use of the fact that they are children to ask the wolf for mercy (*Id.* 8.64) and the watchdog for alertness (l. 66).⁸¹

Not only children, but also women are being introduced into post-Theocritean bucolic poetry in novel ways. Although the world of Theocritus' herdsmen is full of girls at whom the love of the singers is directed, and although these do belong to the rural sphere (the Amaryllis of *Id.* 3 lives in a cave), they do not seem to be active as herdswomen.⁸² Furthermore we do not find any of them as participants in a dialogue. This changes in *Id.* 27, where Acrotyme has to guard a flock herself (l. 47) and also appears to be from a family of herdsmen (at least this is indicated by the name of her father, Menalcas, at l. 44).⁸³ She meets Daphnis as a completely equal partner in a dialogue which, e.g., makes

⁷⁸ Coleman (1977) 107–108 on the same method at Virg. *Ecl.* 2.

⁷⁹ The Polyphemus of *Id.* 11.20–21 did the same with Galatea's good qualities.

⁸⁰ *Idd.* 3.8–10; 11.31–34, Damoetas' praise of his own beauty at *Id.* 6.36–38 is to be seen against the background of this self-appraisal of the Cyclops.

⁸¹ On this peculiarity in comparison to the genuine poems of Theocritus cf. Schmidt (1987) 112–113, who points out that the family motif in *Id.* 8 radiates and also provokes “Genrebilder aus dem Kreis der Tierfamilie” (*Id.* 8.41–42; 69–70).

⁸² When Polyphemus encourages Galatea at *Id.* 11.65 to guard and milk his flock together with him, this is wishful thinking that is made even more unrealistic by the fact that to Galatea, the sea nymph, the land is fundamentally alien: only the bucolic ‘superstar’ Bion succeeds in changing Galatea's nature, [Mosch.] 3.62–63.

⁸³ As far as I can see, the construction of a “shepherd aristocracy” at *Id.* 27.42–44 is unique within the bucolic poetry of Hellenism.

possible the quarrel on the topic of marriage in the style of Catullus' choruses of boys and girls (poem 62). In the 'infantilisation' of the world of herdsmen visible in *Id.* 8 and the inclusion of female counterparts we find traits which will play an important part in Longus' novel.

4. *Myth*

In Theocritus' pastoral poems, we can distinguish between two ways of employing myth: myths are either included as short examples to support a line of argument, or, by means of narrative (the death of Daphnis in the song of Thyrsis of *Id.* 1), monologue or dialogue (Polyphemus in *Idd.* 6 and 11), are made into the central focus of the piece.⁸⁴ As an *aition* of pastoral song,⁸⁵ the myth of Daphnis plays a special role; hence it is not surprising that Theocritus portrays the myth of Polyphemus as its comical counterpart.⁸⁶

In Theocritus, a distance between the world of the herdsmen and that of their mythical predecessors becomes evident, a distance which in spite of all the relationships between the two spheres⁸⁷ is made stronger by differences in how they are further elaborated.⁸⁸ This distance mirrors that which Theocritus also creates between himself and his audience on the one hand and the depicted pastoral world on the other. And just as this distance between poet and herdsmen dwindles in post-Theocritean bucolic poetry, so we can also observe similar things happening on a mythological sphere: in *Id.* 8, Daphnis appears next to Menalcas as an ordinary singer, even though the ending ("and from that day was Daphnis first among the herdsmen") makes it clear that

⁸⁴ With the possibility of introducing as an example also a myth that is described in detail, as in *Id.* 11 the myth of Polyphemus, or in the non-pastoral *Id.* 13 the myth of Hylas.

⁸⁵ Daphnis was considered the inventor of pastoral song: see at least Diod.Sic. 4.84.3–4; according to other sources, his sufferings were the first subject of pastoral song (Stesich. *PMGF* 279 = Aelian, *VH* 10.18).

⁸⁶ Hunter (1999) 248. The frequency with which post-Theocritean bucolic poetry takes up the myth of Polyphemus and Galatea indicates that it continued to be considered as central to this genre: [Bion] 2.2–3; Bion fr. 16; [Moschus] 3.58–63 (cf. on this below p. 197); on the reflection of this myth in Moschus fr. 3 cf. above n. 5.

⁸⁷ It is not until [Bion] 2 that the basic principle is given up by which herdsmen recite a myth that is set in the world of herdsmen.

⁸⁸ Fantuzzi (1998) 63–64 points out the less realistic depiction of the world of herdsmen in the song of Thyrsis, effected mainly by the pathetic fallacy in which even wild beasts, usually natural enemies of the herdsman, are taking part.

we have just been told an episode from the youth of the mythical Daphnis.⁸⁹ This, as Marco Fantuzzi has observed,⁹⁰ leads to a blending which, through a juxtaposition of the mythical Daphnis in *Id.* 1 and Daphnis as an ordinary herdsman in *Id.* 6, had been present, but not put into effect in Theocritus. Fantuzzi's observation is particularly relevant for the history of bucolic poetry since such a 'mythologisation of the world of herdsmen' had so far been considered as an innovation by Virgil. In Virgil, as Bruno Snell had established,⁹¹ Daphnis is not only now a mythical (*Ecl.* 2.26), now an ordinary herdsman (*Ecl.* 7.1 and 9.46), but sometimes both of these simultaneously; for in *Ecl.* 5 Menalcas and Mopsus sing of the death and apotheosis of Daphnis, while at the same time making it clear that they used to be in direct contact with him (e.g. Mopsus as his pupil in *Ecl.* 5.48–49). In one decisive aspect, however, Virgil is far more radical than the poet of *Id.* 8, for in *Ecl.* 5 we find even the barrier between the world of the poet and that of the herdsman being torn down when in l. 86 Menalcas reveals himself to be the poet of *Ecl.* 2 and 3 and thus Virgil himself.⁹² It here becomes clear how within *one* poem the two separations that were so binding for Theocritus (author/pastoral world; pastoral world/myth) are being abandoned at the same time, to the effect that the world of the author comes in direct contact with the world of myth. This, incidentally, is a practice which also dominates the tenth *Eclogue* in which Gallus, and thus a person from the time of the author, is transferred into a time in which he encounters both ordinary herdsmen (20, 36–43) and gods. In the literary model, *Id.* 1, Daphnis is equally represented in dialogue with the gods, but this crucially is the mythic Daphnis.⁹³ Yet in my view, a coincidence of myth and the level of the present can be

⁸⁹ This mythical character also becomes clear from the choice of words in the introductory lines, particularly those of *Id.* 8, which here serves as a model: ὥς φαντί (l. 2) introduces what follows as orally transmitted, and a number of expressions display a particularly epic colouring: συνάντητο (l. 1, its only appearance in the corpus ascribed to Theocritus) is found in Homer seven times, and in *Il.* 21.34 it is said of a hostile encounter in battle. μυκητῶν (l. 6) as an epithet of cattle is reminiscent of the Homeric ἐρίμυκος (Gow (1952) *ad loc.*), and already Σ on ἐπίουγε βοῶν refers to Homer, *Il.* 13.450 and *Od.* 13.405; εἰσοπέδων (l. 9) is an epic epithet of sheep. Gutzwiller (1983b) tries to show how Daphnis' songs in *Id.* 8 can be explained by reference to characteristic traits of myth.

⁹⁰ Fantuzzi (1998).

⁹¹ Snell (1953) 287.

⁹² This was also pointed out by Snell (1953) *ibidem*.

⁹³ In *Id.* 1, too, we find ordinary shepherds (ll. 80–81), but these are only mentioned very briefly, and their names are not given.

found in bucolic poetry already before Virgil: in [Moschus] 3, the *Epitaph for Bion*, the anonymous author has his teacher mourned not only by several gods⁹⁴ (ll. 26–29), but also by Galatea, who already while Bion was still alive had preferred his company and song to that of her mythical suitor, Polyphemus. It is of course remarkable that here—in contrast to *Ecl.* 5—the level of the ordinary herdsmen does not seem to appear (although it had been briefly mentioned even in the song of Thyrsis which formed the model for this piece), so that in the *Epitaph* the presence of the poet is transferred more or less directly into the sphere of bucolic myth. *Id.* 8 thus links myth and the world of herdsmen while keeping the world of the author at a distance, the *Epitaph for Bion* links myth and the world of the author while cutting out the level of ordinary herdsmen, and Virgil establishes a blending of all three levels.⁹⁵

5. *Emotions*

Shepherds in Theocritus often sing of their emotions, particularly of the woes of love and the mourning for a youth overtaken by premature death. In the principal bucolic myth of Daphnis, both of these emotions are united, as suffering from love (in whatever kind of way)⁹⁶ leads to his death. In the *Epitaph for Bion*, which is based on the song of Thyrsis, we also find both emotions linked, for Aphrodite mourns for her beloved. In general, the representation of emotions increases in post-Theocritean bucolic poetry; there are, however, also occasional attempts at keeping the world of the herdsmen and their songs free from emotion throughout the whole of an idyll (*Id.* 9).

Let us first of all look at this emotionalisation through an example in which feelings other than love, or mourning for a deceased, are being

⁹⁴ All are linked to the pastoral sphere, including Apollo (26), who had twice worked as a shepherd himself because of love. Here we can recognise the rule, pointed out by Fantuzzi (1998) 63, according to which ordinary Theocritean herdsmen worship only a very limited circle of pastoral deities (this makes the appearance of Aphrodite to the dying Daphnis in *Id.* 1 all the more striking and underlines his mythical status).

⁹⁵ *Bion* fr. 10, in which a herdsman recounts how Aphrodite appeared to him and asked him to teach the young Eros how to sing, probably is no predecessor in a strict sense; for the encounter takes place in a dream (l. 1), as had been customary for encounters of this kind since time immemorial, cf. Reed (1997) on fr. 10.1.

⁹⁶ Cf. Hunter (1999) 67, with an overview of the various explanations of Daphnis' end, which is only vaguely alluded to in *Id.* 1.

described. At the end of *Id.* 5, Comatas expresses joy at his victory (142–144):

... κήγῶν γάρ ἴδ' ὥς μέγα τοῦτο καχαξῶ
καττῶ Λάκωνος τῷ ποιμένος, ὅτι ποκ' ἦδη
ἀνυσάμαν τὰν ἀμνόν' ἐς ὦρανὸν ὕμιν ἀλεῦμαι.

I'm going to laugh my bellyful at shepherd Lacon—watch me!—just as soon I've dispatched his lamb. You'll see me leap to heaven!

The poet of *Id.* 8 reproduces also this passage from his most important model (ll. 88–91):

ὥς μὲν ὁ παῖς ἐχάρη καὶ ἀνάλατο καὶ πλατάγησε
νικάσας, οὕτως ἐπὶ ματέρει νεβρὸς ἄλοιτο.
ὥς δὲ κατεσμήχθη καὶ ἀνετράπετο φρένα λύπη
ῶτερος, οὕτω καὶ νύμφα δμαθεῖσ' ἀκάχοιτο.

As joyed the lad in his victory and leapt for pleasure and clapped his hands, so might a fawn leap about its dam. And as the other was seared with sorrow and heart-stricken with grief, so would a maiden grieve when wedded.

In the latter, however, the emotions are expressed far more clearly: while Comatas only expresses his intention to show his rejoicing (5.142 καχαξῶ, 144 ἀλεῦμαι), Daphnis' joy is explicitly described by the narrator (8.88 ἐχάρη). The same holds for the mourning of the defeated opponent, which does not have a counterpart in *Id.* 5. This increase is aided by both the multitude and partly also the intensity of the feelings listed for both sides.⁹⁷ In view of a lack of emotions in the opening part, their massive appearance later on seems overdone and little motivated.⁹⁸

The increased significance particularly of erotic feelings is demonstrated by the story contained in Bion fr. 10. The speaker, a herdsman poet, tells how Aphrodite appeared in his dream and entrusted the young Eros to him to give him singing lessons. The narrator teaches him ὅσα βουκολίασδον, “all the rustic songs I used to sing”, i.e. the *aitia* of various musical instruments (befitting the beginning of a musical education). Eros, however, does not heed these teachings, but teaches his teacher erotic songs instead. It has been said that the bucolic poetry forgotten by the speaker under Eros' influence had a counterpart in

⁹⁷ E.g. κατεσμήχθη, “was singed”, said of the effects of Eros at *Id.* 3.17, and the uncompounded verb at Apoll. Rhod. 3.446 and 762.

⁹⁸ A similar concentration of symptoms of love and wrath (in most cases conventionally described) is displayed by *Id.* 20.15–18.

the reality of the poet's own literary career, be it that Bion here autobiographically describes the change from a mythical (non-erotic) to an erotic bucolic poet, be it that he criticises contemporary bucolic poetry of non-erotic contents. But we neither find fragments that could qualify as remnants of an early phase of Bion's creative activity,⁹⁹ nor are there indications of such a type of bucolic poetry against which Bion could have been polemical. Instead we have to understand the poetry which the herdsman teaches Eros in ll. 7–8 from within the train of thought that runs through the fragment; it is just as little 'real' as, e.g., the epic prevented by Cupid at Ovid, *Am.* 1.1.1–2. The logic of the story demands that the poet, before he is influenced by Eros, writes on non-erotic matters; traditionally these would take the form of a heroic epic, which however does not befit a herdsman. Thus Bion chose aitiological myths about the invention of musical instruments by the gods.¹⁰⁰ This choice of subject-matter furthermore forms a suitable basis for the musical instruction Aphrodite had asked for. Yet the erotic poetry taught by the god of love will most likely have had a programmatic content, as the motif 'a god suggests a topic to the poet' usually is employed to explain why the work then following is of a certain character (why, e.g., Ovid's *Amores* are erotic rather than epic). Thus we may view the story told by fr. 10 as an indication of the fact that erotic matters will be given a novel focus in Bion's bucolic poetry. This is confirmed by fragments 9 and 11,¹⁰¹ and the author of the *Epitaph for Bion* stresses ([Moschus] 3.65–69) that after Bion all eroticism had vanished from the world.

The fragment discussed just now is an example of a depiction of eroticism which also appears in the non-pastoral poems of Bion and Moschus: in addition to abstract reflection on the nature of love we also encounter the introduction of the young Eros as a protagonist (apart from Bion fr. 10, see also fr. 13, and Moschus 1). The stimulus for this probably came mainly from epigrammatic poetry,¹⁰² as the epigram *AP* 16.200 = *HE* 2683ff. (handed down under Moschus' name) on Eros as a ploughman indicates.

⁹⁹ With its three verses, fr. 5, which is occasionally also cited in this context, is too short.

¹⁰⁰ The *syrix* is probably missing because its *aition* is of an erotic nature.

¹⁰¹ Cf. also [Moschus] 3.80–84 and Reed (1997) 165.

¹⁰² A further point of comparison from within the works ascribed to Theocritus is the ps.-Theocritean *Id.* 19 (*Eros as a honey-thief*); Reed (1997) 11–12; Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 171.

A culmination of this eroticisation of bucolic poetry is found in the *Epithalamios for Achilles and Deidamia* (= [Bion] 2), whose poet apparently has no problem with giving a bucolic framework to a myth that has nothing to do with the world of herdsmen, and to have one herdsman tell it to another.¹⁰³ The erotic character of this myth alone probably is sufficient for an association with bucolic poetry, with the Theocritean Polyphemus (who himself is a herdsman) perhaps serving as the model for the eroticisation of a martial figure from Homer (Il. 1–3).¹⁰⁴ In *Id.* 27 (*Oaristys*) the increased importance of eroticism can be inferred from the fact that the erotic activity here, in contrast to Theocritus (and also [Theocr.] *Id.* 8 and 20), is not the subject-matter of the song or the lament, but takes place within the dialogue.¹⁰⁵

Within the bucolic world of Theocritus, the songs of the herdsman play a twofold role: on the one hand they are part of the peaceful and harmonic scene painted by bucolic poetry (ἄσυχία). In the opening of *Id.* 1 this is expressed as a leitmotif when the sweetness of the pastoral music competes with that of the surrounding *locus amoenus* (ll. 1–8). Pastoral song on the other hand usually treats of the sufferings from love of the herdsman himself or of mythical predecessors (Daphnis or Polyphemus), a phenomenon which stands in contrast to the ἄσυχία of the individual's surroundings. On several occasions in Theocritus' pastoral poems, this contrast is clearly visible, as e.g. in the description of the *kissybion* which, as we know, programmatically presents the principles of Theocritus' poetry. There, the description of a boy absorbed in the weaving of a cricket trap—an image of the bucolic poet¹⁰⁶—is contrasted with the vignette which shows two young men engaged in a futile quarrel over a woman (*Id.* 1.32–38 and 44–54).¹⁰⁷ The *locus amoenus* at the end of *Id.* 7, already prepared by the ending of the song of Simichidas, also appears as the polar opposite of the passionate love which had been the topic of the two songs of the poem.¹⁰⁸ The harmonious co-existence displayed by Daphnis and Damoetas in the story

¹⁰³ At least in the surviving opening passage such a connection is not visible (with the exception of the description of Paris as βωκόλος at l. 10), nor is it clear how the myth in its further course should have taken such a turn.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 176 and n. 152.

¹⁰⁵ In this respect, *Id.* 27 is an important precedent for Longus, as is emphasised by Arland (1937) 62, cf. also above pp. 185–186.

¹⁰⁶ Hunter (1999) on *Id.* 1.45–54.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. also *Id.* 11.72, where the weaving of baskets is listed among the activities Polyphemus admonishes himself to carry out in order to forget Galatea.

¹⁰⁸ Fantuzzi (2003) 175–176.

which forms the framework of *Id.* 6—even though their songs depict the hopelessly complicated relationship of Polyphemus and Galatea—also illustrates this contrast.¹⁰⁹

From the highlighted ambivalence of the pastoral song—part of the bucolic *locus amoenus*, but often concerned with problematic topics—we arrive at the conclusion that he who sings about his suffering from love by doing so alleviates this suffering and thus brings the peace of his surroundings back into his heart. The *locus classicus* supporting this view is *Id.* 11, in which Polyphemus' song is a symptom of his love (ll. 13 and 39) and a φάρμακον for it (i.e. a palliative, ll. 1–3)¹¹⁰ at the same time. The success of this autotherapy (of which the reader may indeed have his doubts) is metaphorically described by the narrator as ποιμαίνειν (l. 80), a word which normally refers to the control of the herdsman over his flock (l. 65). This choice of words, and the description of the φάρμακον by the key term ἁδύ in l. 3, suggests the view that Polyphemus restores the peace of the world surrounding him also in his own soul.

A trait which we have above come to know as an element of Theocritean realism also serves as a contrast to the woes of love sung by the herdsman: the repeated reference to the animals within his flock mounting each other, animals whose satisfaction of their natural drives is uncomplicated and free of emotion, stands in contrast to the erotic suffering of the herdsmen. This perception becomes most visible when Priapus reproaches Daphnis, dying from his lovesickness, by comparing him to a goatherd (*Id.* 1.86–87). The uninhibited mounting which is possible to the billy-goat (this is the final image of *Id.* 1.151–152) is impossible for the goatherd; thus the sight of the former causes the latter pain.¹¹¹ We also find other herdsmen serving as representatives of an obscenely portrayed, uncomplicated sexuality, as e.g. the old man whom Battus compares with the Satyrs and Pans—half human, half beast—at the end of *Id.* 4. The more tender form of eroticism, however, only finds a brief and probably parodic representation in Battus' short lament for Amaryllis in *Id.* 4: see above all ll. 38–40.

¹⁰⁹ Bernsdorff (1994) 40–44. In *Id.* 10, too, love (and love poetry) stand in contrast to the everyday lives of the reapers (and the songs they sing while working). This opposition, however, is different from that in the pastoral poems, because love does not threaten the peace and quiet, but the vital hard work.

¹¹⁰ Köhnken (1996) 181–183; a similar view also at *Id.* 10.21–23.

¹¹¹ I follow the interpretation of Hunter (1999) on *Id.* 1.86–91.

As we have seen above, this obscene element mostly vanishes in post-Theocritean bucolic poetry, to the effect that the contrast described above also ceases to exist. Something of it can be found in *Id.* 27, where Acrotyme twice counters Daphnis' advances with the address σατυγίσκε (ll. 3 and 49) and thus blames him for carnality by using the same word which Battus also uses at the end of *Id.* 4 (l. 62) when he reproaches the lecherous old man. The literal references to Theocritus, however, only serve to emphasise the differences present. In *Id.* 27, the love act and the banter preceding it are by no means represented obscenely nor do they appear in the marginal position which is so typical of Theocritean descriptions of crude sexuality.¹¹² Instead they occupy a central position. This is remarkable in that a shepherd here succeeds in something which Theocritean herdsman and almost all heroes of ancient love poetry normally fail to achieve—fulfilment of desire, with an emphasis on the mutual pleasures of man and woman (ll. 66–71)¹¹³—a failure which presents a great problem to them. That it is a herdsman by the name of Daphnis who succeeds in finding that fulfilment makes it all the more special: the mythical Daphnis¹¹⁴ had suffered from love so much that he met his death. With its depiction of fulfilled and mutually satisfying love between shepherd and shepherdess, *Id.* 27 points away from the concept of love found in bucolic poetry, and towards that found in the romance novel—the proximity of this poem to Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* has already been pointed out above—a concept with which the view of marriage found in this poem fits in well.¹¹⁵

The successors of Theocritus, however, employ other views of eroticism: thus in *Id.* 8 we find Daphnis and Menalcas describing the sorrows caused to them and their surroundings by the absence of their beloved (*Id.* 8.47, 44, 43, 48). Menalcas sends the billy-goat to his beloved Milon to woo for him (ll. 49–52), Daphnis paints a picture of the longing for women and the effects it has on men in dark colours rich in Sapphic imagery (*Id.* 8.57–60) and a little later reports how he therefore had to reject the advances of a girl (ll. 72–75). The two

¹¹² Cf. Stanzel (1995) 88 on the frequent use of obscenities at the end of Theocritean idylls.

¹¹³ The exceptional character of *Id.* 27 is emphasised by Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 179–180, who furthermore draws attention to the effectiveness of the topos of the rape/seduction in a *locus amoenus* (as e.g. in Archil. *IEG* 196a).

¹¹⁴ There are no indications that it is the mythical Daphnis whom we find in *Id.* 27.

¹¹⁵ *Id.* 27.24–33, 35.

series of priamels which he then adds on (ll. 72–75; 76 and 78)—in their anaphoric use of ἄδύ clearly following *Id.* 1.1–2—praise details of the life of herdsmen and culminate in the statement that the cattle is a cowherd's adornment. These series can only be linked with the preceding story of how Daphnis reproached a girl in the way proposed by Gow:¹¹⁶ “Daphnis’ pleasures are found elsewhere ... a herdsman’s business lies with his herd, not with young women in caves”. Here the amenities of the pastoral world thus form a clear contrast to the disturbances caused by Eros. Yet at the same time it must be noted that *Id.* 8 looks not only at the agony caused by separation from one’s beloved, but also at the joy of being reunited to a degree not found in Theocritus. For the application of the pathetic fallacy serves Daphnis and Menalcas as a way of praising the blessings associated with the presence of the beloved just as much as to describe the negative consequences of the beloved’s absence. We may thus say that both here and similarly in *Id.* 27 a heightened sense of a fulfilled erotic relationship can be observed.¹¹⁷ This also goes well with the narrator’s anticipation (l. 93) of the marriage between Daphnis and the Nais of l. 43.¹¹⁸

Regarding the relationship of songs and framework in *Id.* 8, one does have the impression that, as also in *Id.* 6, the two herdsmen remain unmoved by their own song and seem to consider it as a kind of artistic exercise, even though they—unlike the herdsmen in *Id.* 6—sing of their own loves. This is probably meant to be made more natural by the fact that they (again unlike the herdsmen of *Id.* 6) are still children. As in *Id.* 6, this aloofness of course needs to be seen against the background of the later mythic biographies: Daphnis—and it is mainly he who puts the opposition between the life of herdsmen and the woes of love into words¹¹⁹—will later die of an excess of these woes (*Id.* 1), but according to Hermesianax, *CA* fr. 3 Menalcas, too, is said to have thrown himself off a rock because his love for the nymph Euippe had been unrequited. In *Id.* 8 we thus get the impression that we are listening to two herdsmen who may be able to sing of their beloveds¹²⁰ in bucolic fashion and also have a certain insight into the

¹¹⁶ Gow (1952) on *Id.* 8.76–78., with whom Gutzwiller (1983b) 179 agrees.

¹¹⁷ Theocr. *Id.* 7.133 only represents a vague allusion: the companions of Simichidas, among them the καλὸς Ἀμύντιχος, lie down for a banquet in a *locus amoenus*.

¹¹⁸ The difference from the bucolic poetry of Theocritus has already been pointed out by Schmidt (1987) 114. Cf. also above n. 113.

¹¹⁹ This connection was pointed out by Gutzwiller (1983b) 177–178.

¹²⁰ Gutzwiller (1983b) 179 interprets Daphnis’ love for the nymph (*Id.* 8.43 and 48)

dangers and joys of love. But in spite of such 'theoretical' knowledge they are not safe from their subsequent fate. As a result, however, the author of *Id.* 8 digresses even further from the relation between framework and song found in *Id.* 6: in the latter, Daphnis had taken part in the 'performance' of the myth of Polyphemos and Galatea without suspecting that this myth was anticipating crucial points of his own later suffering.¹²¹

We find *Id.* 9 to be very much in accord with the contrast between eroticism and the bucolic world already outlined—albeit in a form which in both frame and songs describes only the peace and amenities of the life of herdsmen, a life viewed as free from erotic involvement. The general ἐρῶν in l. 13, used in a comparison, is all that remains of the standard topic.¹²² As will soon become clear, the ideal of an 'eros-free' pastoral existence at the end of *Id.* 9 also seems to be a poetological reflexion. This contrast is then enhanced in an epigrammatic manner in the already discussed fr. 10 of Bion, in which, under Eros' influence, the herdsman forgets all the subject-matter of his earlier songs (wholly unerotic aitiological myths) and takes up the ἐρωτύλα of Eros. The world of herdsmen (together with its music and poetry) thus appears as a sphere untouched by eroticism.¹²³

We turn now to the other emotion central to bucolic poetry. The *Epitaph for Bion* (= [Moschus] 3) follows the model of the *Epitaph for Adonis* composed by Bion himself in that the motif of mourning is seen as the central focus.¹²⁴ The song of Thyrsis (to which the *Epitaph for Bion* is closer than to the *Epitaph for Adonis* in that it mourns a 'herdsman-poet') was only an insertion into *Id.* 1 and represented the counterpart to the *ekphrasis* of the *kissybion*. One could also show on the basis of linguistic features and details of the motifs employed how

and his rejection of the girl (73–75) as part of a childlike and naive devotion to nature, which would be disturbed by the contact with a mortal woman. In the case of the parallel love of Menalcas for Milon, the erotic dimension can not be toned down in the same way.

¹²¹ Bernsdorff (1994), Hunter (1999) 247–248.

¹²² I follow Gow's (1952) reading of this verse, which, however, does not seem completely certain to me. The explanations cited by him, which follow the Σ in reading ἐρῶντι and taking it as a predicate to a παῖδες which would have to be supplied, must thus refer ἐρῶν to the love of children. This, too, could be seen as an indication of the disappearing of erotic themes.

¹²³ Thus also Fantuzzi (2003) 177–178.

¹²⁴ Bion fr. 1 is part of a poem which probably concentrated on the grief of Apollo for the dead Hyacinthus, cf. Reed (1997) 28.

much the pathos of mourning is heightened here by comparison with the model.¹²⁵ Suffice it to point out the particularly pronounced use of the pathetic fallacy, a trope which will become very important in Virgil and all subsequent European bucolic poetry.¹²⁶

After only sporadic and vague examples in earlier poetry¹²⁷ and one subtle appearance in Theocritus, who makes both wild and tame animals (*Id.* 1.71–75) and elsewhere trees and mountains (*Id.* 7.73–75) mourn for Daphnis,¹²⁸ the songs of *Id.* 8 for the first time show a distinctive use of the pathetic fallacy, which now does not appear as an expression of mourning: at ll. 33–40 in the demand towards nature to take good care of the flocks in exchange for the song offered, at ll. 45–48 in the idea that nature would blossom when the beloved is close by.¹²⁹ Falling back on the song of Thyrsis, Bion in the *Epitaph for Adonis* describes the sympathy for Adonis of animals, plants and landscape, but only in a tightly confined space (18–19, 23–24, 31–39, 76).

The *Epitaph for Bion* then applies this method over long stretches of text and in an intensity not previously encountered: the mourning, for example, for the deceased poet is so great that it even links areas which are traditionally considered to be opposites in bucolic poetry, for it is not only the rural sphere that mourns for the bucolic poet but at ll. 86–92 also “all cities” (πᾶσα ... πόλις, ἅσ τεα πάντα). In the image of the sea nymph Galatea who now sorrowfully sits on the beach and guards the cattle of Bion, we find resolved yet another contrast still irreconcilable in Theocritus, namely that of land and sea.

In the *Epitaph for Bion*, the pathetic fallacy is manifest not only in the fact that nature actively takes part in the lament and mourning for Bion, but also in that a part of nature dies together with him.¹³⁰ Once

¹²⁵ An instructive comparison with *Id.* 1 and the Bionean *Epitaph for Adonis* is offered by Arland (1937) 44–45; on [Moschus] 3 overall cf. the powerful interpretation of Schmidt (1972) 69–92.

¹²⁶ *Ecl.* 1.5; 2.5; 5.8; 6.2–6.3; 6.84; 10.8. Cf. Schmidt (1972) 76; on the pathetic fallacy in general Schmidt (1987) 116–122, Fantuzzi (1998) 63–64, Reed (1997) on the *Epitaph for Adonis* 31–39, Hunter (1999) on *Id.* 1.71–75.

¹²⁷ Overview in Fantuzzi (1998) 64, n. 9.

¹²⁸ On related views in Theocritus (*Id.* 1.132–133; plants should bear the wrong flowers; *Id.* 6.44: calves “dance” to the music of the *syrix*) see Hunter (1999) on *Id.* 1.71–75.

¹²⁹ Passages such as these will probably have made it easier for Virgil to incorporate the topic of the Golden Age into his bucolic poetry; cf. *Ecl.* 4.23 *ipsa tibi blandos fundent cunabula flores*, “the cradle itself will pour out flowers to delight you”; the αὐτόματον motif already at Hes. *Op.* 117–118.

¹³⁰ A ‘realistic’ model can be found in the neglected state of the flock while the

again, the model here is Adonis, whose death and rebirth symbolise the change of the seasons. Bion, however, only makes use of the ‘death of nature’ motif in one hemistich,¹³¹ while the author of the *Epitaph for Bion* dedicates six verses (30–35) to it.¹³² Bion does not have this power over nature because he is a god of vegetation such as Adonis (this possibility is implicitly dismissed in l. 101), but because of his outstanding poetic ability. This is already indicated by the role of honey at ll. 33–35, whose mourning is explained with reference to its sympathy for the “deceased” honey of the bucolic poet Bion. Bion’s power over nature can furthermore be seen in the lament of the nightingales that arises once they have heard of his death (l. 47).¹³³ Galatea, too, who has left the sea because of Bion’s song, can be seen as a symbol of the power that art has over nature.¹³⁴

With the relation between pastoral song and nature the author touches upon a basic subject of bucolic poetry. *Locus classicus* in this respect is the beginning of *Id.* 1, which is characterised by the analogy of the sounds of nature and of art.¹³⁵ Here the statement that the sound of the goatherd’s *syrix* is as sweet as the sounds of the *locus amoenus* is a great praise; but the herdsman can even surpass nature, as for example when Thyrsis’ song is described as sounding sweeter than a spring (ll. 8–9), or when it is said that he sings better than a cicada and should have his mouth filled with honey (ll. 146–148).¹³⁶ Bion, who teaches nature and at whose death nature dies, now appears as the final winner in this perpetual competition between nature and art. Thus we cannot be surprised that even Pan is afraid of being defeated by Bion (ll. 55–56). At the beginning of *Id.* 1 (l. 3), it almost goes without saying that the god who, because of his mixed nature and his creation of

herdsman is absent as described by Theocr. *Id.* 4.12–20; the blooming of nature in response to the approaching beloved at [Theocr.] *Id.* 8.41–47 had provided a positive model.

¹³¹ Bion, *Epitaph for Adonis* 76 ἄνθεα πάντα ἔμαράνθη, “all the flowers faded”.

¹³² The silence of Echo, which is listed as the first element at 30–31a, can here still be perceived as a natural result of the silence of Bion.

¹³³ Cf. on the other hand *Id.* 8.37–38, where Daphnis considers the ability to sing like a nightingale as his highest goal; cf. also *Id.* 5.136.

¹³⁴ As we know, the swapping of habitats between terrestrial and maritime animals has been an *adynaton* topos since Archil. *IEG* 122, cf. Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) on Hor. *C.* 1.2.9.

¹³⁵ Hunter (1999) on *Id.* 1.1–3, who sees the pathetic fallacy of the song of Thyrsis prepared in that passage.

¹³⁶ Again an analogy between the sweetness of honey and that of song; Schmidt (1972) 78 points to the relation with [Moschus] 3.34–35.

the *syrinx* from reed, embodies the dualism between nature and culture unlike any other in the bucolic world¹³⁷ would of course win the first prize with his *syrinx*-play.¹³⁸ The superiority of Bion over nature that is emerging here fits together with a stylisation of Bion into Orpheus (ll. 18, 22, 123–126), the mythical model of the victory of culture over nature. Unlike the plants (and Adonis!), Bion may be subject to the fate of not being reborn in the following year (ll. 99–107), but the poem can nevertheless close by saying that, because of his song, Bion will return into the bucolic world just as Orpheus was able to effect the return of Eurydice.¹³⁹

In post-Theocritean bucolic poetry there is a sharp focus on the relation between poetry and the experience of being in love, which had particularly been treated in one of the two Polyphemus poems. Both of the views present there—poetry as a symptom and a φάρμακον of love¹⁴⁰—are continued overall, but are being worded with considerable modifications and with an alacrity that is far greater and reminiscent of epigram. This applies especially to Bion. His fr. 3, which possibly belongs to a Polyphemus poem, contrasts the two views of love:¹⁴¹

Μοῖσας Ἔρωσ καλέοι, Μοῖσαι τὸν Ἔρωτα φέροιεν.
 μολπὰν ται Μοῖσαι μοι αἰ ποθέοντι δίδοιεν,
 τὰν γλυκερὰν μολπὰν, τᾶς φάρμακον ἄδιον οὐδέν.

Let Eros call the Muses, let the Muses bear Eros. Let the Muses give me song while I forever desire, sweet song, than which no medicine is sweeter.

Love elicits poetic production (1a) and helps bear one's love (1b, 3b ~ *Id.* 11.53). The view of pastoral song as medicine is basically made into the stock topic of the genre. Thus the herdsman in *Id.* 20 appears as a reflection of Polyphemus also in that, at the end of his song, he seems to have distanced himself from his aloof beloved, although his success is less doubtful than that of his model. Thus a part of the ironic refraction of the original is also lost.¹⁴² Another example can be found in Virgil's *Ecl.* 2, where Corydon, in clear imitation of the Theocritean

¹³⁷ Hunter (1999) 15.

¹³⁸ Mumprecht (1964) on ll. 55 and 56 emphasises only the reference to *Id.* 1.123–130, where the dying Pan wants to give his *syrinx* over to Daphnis.

¹³⁹ Yet what is special here is that Bion can only effect his return himself, and thus Orpheus and Eurydice are more or less combined, cf. Hubbard (1998), 44.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. above p. 192.

¹⁴¹ Thus Reed (1997) 145 and Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 184–185.

¹⁴² Arland (1937) 55–58.

Polyphemus, calls himself back from his longing for Alexis to the everyday activities of a herdsman (here tellingly his weaving)¹⁴³ at the end of his song. Marco Fantuzzi has shown how the conception of bucolic poetry, represented by the chirping of an ἀρξίς, as a healer of the lovesick heart also operates beyond the boundaries of the genre.¹⁴⁴ In Gallus' (futile) attempt at curing his lovesickness with bucolic song in *Ecl.* 10, the opposition also holds strong.¹⁴⁵

So far it has gone unnoticed how the view of poetry as φάρμακον is propagated in [Theocr.] *Id.* 9. In the final song the speaker explains his love for the Muses by reference to the special protection they offer to those they favour: Circe's potion cannot harm them (ll. 35–36). The casting of Circe's spell has been considered to be an *exemplum* generally signifying a great threat, comparable to the walking on Scythian shores in Propertius (3.16.13–14).¹⁴⁶ This mythologeme, however, seems to be too specific for such a general reference and thus, as has already been remarked by the scholia, probably represents a concrete evocation of the scene in which Odysseus holds his ground against Circe's witchcraft by means of the μῶλυ.¹⁴⁷ This of course poses the question what Odysseus and the favourite of the Muses have in common, what the *moly* and the gift of the Muses have in common, and what kind of threat is symbolised by Circe's potion. Attempts at associating the poet with Odysseus on the basis of various shared traits¹⁴⁸ can hardly explain this comparison.

A solution reveals itself when one considers the allegorical interpretation of the *moly* episode which is first attested in Cleanthes.¹⁴⁹ According to him, the *moly* represents the *logos* that protects Odysseus from being seduced by Circe. The transformation of the other men into animals thus signifies the loss of their reason and their giving in to their desires. This allegorising interpretation of the *moly* episode seems to be supported also by Σ *Id.* 9.33–36:

¹⁴³ Cf. above p. 191.

¹⁴⁴ Fantuzzi (2003) 177 on Meleager, *AP* 7.196 = *HE* 4066ff. and *AP* 7.195 = *HE* 4058ff.

¹⁴⁵ Fantuzzi (2003) 184.

¹⁴⁶ Cited by Cholmeley (1901) who comments *ad loc.*: "the lover and the favoured of the Muses bear alike a sacred inviolable life". See also Faraone, this volume, pp. 78, 87–88.

¹⁴⁷ Here I follow Parry (1987), particularly p. 8.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. Parry (1987) 14 who points out, for example, that Odysseus is likened to an excellent singer at Homer, *Od.* 11.368.

¹⁴⁹ *SVF* 1.526; cf. on this and related views Kaiser (1964) 209–210.

τὸν Ὀδυσσεά σοφὸν ὄντα οὐ κατέθελξε τὰ τῆς Κίρκης φάρμακα· τοὺς δὲ ἐταίρους ἀγνώμονας ὄντας καὶ ἀπερισκέπτους ἀπεθηρίωσεν ὁ κυκεών. συνώδεις γὰρ ἦσαν καὶ ἀμαθεῖς καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς Κίρκης δυνάμενοι τῷ ποτῷ μεταμορφωθῆναι εἰς ἄλογα ζῶα.

Circe's φάρμακα could not enchant Odysseus, because he was wise: but his companions, who were reckless and thoughtless, the potion made into animals. For they were boorish (lit. 'swinish') and ignorant, and could be turned into dumb beasts through the drink by Circe.

When it is said that he who is favoured by the Muses receives the same protection as Odysseus, this implies the image of the Muses as the givers of reason and understanding. In this context one can also refer to the βασιλῆες ἐχέφρονες (Hesiod, *Theog.* 88), favourites of the Muses that are administering the law, or to the protective role ascribed to the Muses also in relation to philosophy and science.¹⁵⁰

If the interpretation of the final sentence of *Id.* 9 just proposed is correct, and the speaker loves the Muses because they offer protection against the sufferings of love, then the ending of the poem represents a variation of the opening of the above-quoted *Id.* 11, in which the Muses appear as a remedy against Eros,¹⁵¹ a passage which in turn alludes to the Circe episode in the *Odyssey*.¹⁵² The comparison with this underlying passage, however, also brings to the fore a difference that is important for the understanding of the whole of *Id.* 9. In *Id.* 11, the Muses provide a *remedy* against an Eros¹⁵³ who has already taken hold of his victim, while the *moly* represents a *repellant*. This view of the gift of the Muses, then, is completely in line with the whole of *Id.* 9 in which eroticism, as we saw above, has vanished almost completely, with the exception of a rather weak comparison in the songs of the herdsmen. The retelling of the songs illustrates the praise of the Muses and particularly the maxim

¹⁵⁰ The intellectualist viewpoint of the Muses can, by the way, also be found in the Σ *Id.* 11.1–3: οὐδὲν ἔξωτός μοι δοκεῖ φάρμακον πεφυκέναι εἰ μὴ ἡ παιδεία καὶ αἱ Μοῦσαι, “it seems to me that there is no other remedy for love than education and the Muses”, or on 11.3–4 τὸ κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν ἔρᾶν κουφότητα παρέχει τῷ πάθει, “loving in accordance with philosophy makes suffering lighter”. With a view to the abatement of love that Polyphemus effected through poetry, Callim. *AP* 12.150.4 = *HE* 1050 says ἡ πανακὴς πάντων φάρμακον ἡ σοφία “poetry is a medicine which cures all evils”. On this, cf. also Gutzwiller, this volume, pp. 20–23.

¹⁵¹ It was Parry (1987) 10–11 who pointed out the conceptual proximity between *Id.* 9.35–36 and the beginning of *Id.* 11; but he does not pursue the intertextual relation any further.

¹⁵² Hunter (1999) on *Id.* 11.4 with reference to εὐρεῖν δ' οὐ ῥᾶδιον as alluding to *Od.* 10.305–306.

¹⁵³ Köhnken (1996) 181–183.

concluding this praise in the same way as is meant to be achieved by Polyphemus' song in relation to the opening maxim of *Id.* 11.

Furthermore, the view that love *provokes* song is being given greater attention than in Theocr. *Id.* 11 and Bion fr. 3. In yet another fragment, 9, Bion radicalises this point of view (with recourse to earlier authors)¹⁵⁴ by saying that the Muses only ever favour those in love, which thus makes the individual's experience of love a fundamental prerequisite for their poetry. This goes further than fr. 10, which only describes the change of poetic topics under the influence of love.¹⁵⁵ In Greek poetry, the experience, referred to in fr. 9, of being unable to write about anything else once under the influence of love apparently is limited to the *Anacreontea*, to whose poetics it then becomes central.¹⁵⁶ It mainly, however, serves the Latin poets in constructing a *recusatio*.¹⁵⁷ The aesthetic appreciation of personal love poetry as observed in fr. 9 makes it clear that there is a justification for viewing post-Theocritean bucolic poetry as an important model for Roman love elegy.¹⁵⁸

6. *Genre awareness*

In spite of the formal and content-related heterogeneity of bucolic poetry after Theocritus which has now become clear, we do also find indications of a rising awareness of genre.¹⁵⁹ Thus we find, e.g., bucolic

¹⁵⁴ Eur. fr. 663 Kannicht; Nicias, *SH* 566 (according to Σ *ad loc.* a reply to *Id.* 11).

¹⁵⁵ Above pp. 189–190.

¹⁵⁶ Reed (1997) 69; Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 183.

¹⁵⁷ Reed (1997) on fr. 10.12–13.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 183–185, who then points out that the declaration of Bion's Polyphemus (fr. 16) that for the rest of his life he would not give up his hope of winning Galatea foreshadows the *domina* image of elegy. An important difference, as he remarks, consists in the fact that Polyphemus is a mythical figure and that, here and in other first-person statements in the fragments of Bion, we cannot know whether the "I" of the speaker is to be identified with the poet: thus, a subjectivity of the kind found in Roman love elegy cannot be established: Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 186. If [Virg.] *Catalept.* 9.13–22 really implies that Messalla wrote Greek bucolic poetry, in which he had herdsmen glorify his beloved (*SH* 558a), this would be a further indication of the convergence of bucolic poetry and elegy in later Hellenism.

¹⁵⁹ On the meaning of the idea of "poetic succession" already in the pastoral poems of Theocritus, but mainly also in his successors cf. Hubbard (1998) 19–44, whose metapoetic interpretation of *Id.* 8 and 9 (pp. 34–37), however, I am not prepared to follow, cf. above pp. 178–179 with n. 51.

key words that poets particularly like to employ. Of particular importance in this context is ἄδύς, “pleasant, sweet”, the first word of *Id.* 1, in the course and particularly in the opening passage (ll. 1–8) of which it takes on a programmatic function.¹⁶⁰ In post-Theocritean bucolic poetry, this word does not only appear with an overall large frequency; a large number of its occurrences are also found in a poetological context:¹⁶¹ the beginning of *Id.* 1 is being evoked either by further choice of diction (*Id.* 20.28 ἄδὺ δέ μοι τὸ μέλισμα, καὶ ἦν σύριγγι μελίσδω, κτλ. “sweet also is the music I make, be it of the pipe, etc.” ~ *Id.* 1.1–3) or through formal similarities—anaphoric use of ἄδύ at *Id.* 8.76–78 and 9.7–8, or its initial position at *Id.* 20.1 and [Bion] fr. 2.1, where it is combined with other allusions to the opening passage of *Id.* 1 and Theocritus’ pastoral poems in general.¹⁶²

In Bion, μελίσδεν, “to make music” also seems to develop into a beacon word; this term is used by Theocritus not only at *Id.* 1.2, but also programmatically in combination with ἄδύ¹⁶³ at *Id.* 7.89 to describe the music of Comatas, the mythical herdsman.

In his contrasting of erotically motivated and other poetry in fr. 9, Bion twice (ll. 5 and 10) uses μελίσδεν in relation to the former (which he prefers), including one instance (l. 5) in combination with ἄδύ. The other form of poetry, which is here being depreciated, is described in conjunction with αἰδεῖν (l. 3), but also the elevated μέλπειν (8). That this word is used as a kind of technical term here is confirmed in Bion fr. 10, where μέλπειν is used of the kind of song which Eros is meant to learn from the herdsman (l. 4).¹⁶⁴

¹⁶⁰ For further theoretical background cf. Hunter (1999) on *Id.* 1.1; Schmidt (1972) 29–32.

¹⁶¹ E.g. four out of eight instances in Bion: fr. 3.3; 8.3; 9.5; 10.8. Probably linked to this use of the word is the fact that the φάρμακον which has poisoned Bion is called ἦδεξ (= ἀηδέξ) in [Moschus] 3.109; cf. also ἐγλυκάνθη in the following line and the use of ἄδύς [Moschus] 3.82, 120, 124.

¹⁶² On the initial position of *dulcis* at Virg. *Ecl.* 1, 3 cf. Sickel (1976) 36; Hubbard (1998), 38–39 on the imitation of Theocritus, which can be seen in the concept of Sicilian song, the use of the Polyphemus example and the employment of the name of Lycidas.

¹⁶³ “μελι- ... suggests τὸ μέλι ‘honey’, thus emphasising the sweetness of bucolic”, Hunter (1999) on *Id.* 1.2. μελίσδεν is not found elsewhere in the genuine poems of Theocritus, but cf. Theocr. (?) *AP* 6.177.1 = *HE* 3398, and *Syrinx* 17.

¹⁶⁴ This completes the list of the instances of these verbs in Bion. In the rest of post-Theocritean bucolic poetry, μέλπειν is of course also used to describe bucolic song, e.g. [Theocr.] *Id.* 8.83 and *passim*.

One can also observe the consolidation of a trait which is innate to the very character of bucolic poetry and is visible already in Theocritus: reflection on one's own poetry.¹⁶⁵ I have already addressed the interest in the relation between eroticism and poetry, as also the increased awareness of form that can be found in *Id.* 8. In this context one should look at a passage from *Id.* 8 (ll. 55–56) already discussed in a different context.¹⁶⁶ Taking Renahan's defense of the transmitted text¹⁶⁷ for granted, Menalcas refers to his activity as specifically bucolic song—singing of his sheep, as he actually does at ll. 63–70—and depicts it as part of an ideal existence clearly demarcated from other lifestyles. In my view, the reflection on the writing of bucolic poetry in *Id.* 9 goes further than has been recognised by scholars to date. The gifts that the speaker presents to the singers at ll. 22–27 had both already been linked to the world of herdsmen in earlier poetry—which is immediately visible in the case of the *χορύνα*, the crooked staff for Daphnis, which Simichidas receives as a *Μοισᾶν ξεινίον* in recognition for his song in *Id.* 7, cf. ll. 19, 43, 128–129. The conch-shell horn presented to Menalcas also appears as an instrument of herdsmen at Euripides, *IT* 303.

In this pair of gifts, a special desire for antithesis¹⁶⁸ takes effect which also seems to dominate other parts of the poem as, e.g., the contrast of summer and winter in the songs of Daphnis and Menalcas. The relation between the staff that has grown on a field and the conch-shell horn found on a seashore is a variation of the contrast that had been established in the bucolic tradition since Theocritus' Polyphemus poems.¹⁶⁹ At l. 24, it is said that the *χορύνα* is "self-grown" (*αὐτοφυής*), but that no carpenter could have criticised it, i.e. its natural crook could have been perceived as artfully fashioned. The mentioning of the *τέκτων* in the same l. 24 establishes a further link between this passage and *Id.* 7 where Lycidas, right after announcing that he wants to give Simichidas his *χορύνα*, dismisses the *τέκτων* who wants to erect a house as high as the peaks of the Oromedon (i.e. a poet who, unlike Simichidas, does not know his limitations). With the idea of nature that is as perfect as art, the poet presents a

¹⁶⁵ On this subject in general, with particular emphasis on Virgil, Schmidt (1972).

¹⁶⁶ Cf. above n. 68.

¹⁶⁷ Renahan (1965).

¹⁶⁸ On this aspect in Theocritus in general cf. Ott (1969).

¹⁶⁹ Cf. later also Moschus fr. 1.

variation on a topos which appears across various genres and in various forms.¹⁷⁰ The reference to the “Dichterweihe” of *Id.* 7, in whose context we find fundamental poetological reflections, raises the question whether the *χορὺνα* in *Id.* 9 has a poetological significance that goes beyond this intertextual link. In my view, such a significance certainly exists in the case of *αὐτοφυής*, “self-grown”.¹⁷¹ The perfect naturalness of the crooked staff reflects the poetic achievement of its winner, as does the conch-shell horn, an instrument whose natural state is preserved completely.¹⁷² An indication of such a significance for *αὐτοφυής* can also be seen from the fact that rhetorical theory apparently linked this adjective to the *χαρακτήρ ἰσχνός*.¹⁷³ On the example of *λεπτός*, Erich Reitzenstein has demonstrated that the poetological terminology of Callimachus and his successors is concordant with the rhetorical theory of the *genera dicendi* in various respects.¹⁷⁴ The ground for the assignment of bucolic poetry to the *γένος ἰσχνόν* found in later genre systematisations¹⁷⁵ is prepared by such terminological links.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷⁰ Cf. e.g. Longus 4.2.5 of the cover of tree leaves in Lamon’s garden: ἐδόκει μέντοι καὶ ἡ τούτων φύσις εἶναι τέχνης, “but also their natural growth seemed to be art”. On the significance of the art-over-nature topos in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* cf. Solodow (1988) 210–214.

¹⁷¹ The mention of the *τέκτων* also provides an indication of this interpretation, as it is not only in the model passage *Id.* 7.45 that he serves as “a familiar analogue (or contrast) for the poet” (Hunter (1999), on *Id.* 7.45–46, cf. Asper (1997) 191, n. 254).

¹⁷² A shepherd’s crook could be the bearer of a ‘stylistic’ quality also at Virg. *Ecl.* 8.16, where a pastoral song is introduced by the line *incumbens tereti Damon sic coepit olivae* “leaning on a smooth olive staff Damon started thus”; according to some critics, however, *oliva* refers here to a tree.

¹⁷³ Dion. Hal. *Isae.* 11.9–11 Usener-Radermacher (in comparing the language of a client of Lysias with that of a client of Isaeus: καὶ γὰρ αἱ λέξεις καὶ τὰ νοήματα παρ’ ἐκείνῳ μὲν τὸ αὐτοφύες, παρὰ δὲ τούτῳ τὸ κατασκευαστὸν ἀποφαίνουσιν, “the one’s style and thoughts appear natural, the other’s artificial”. Proclus, Σ Plato, *Parm.* p. 645.24–27 Cousin: ταῖς τε γὰρ διαλεκτικαῖς μεθόδοις προσήκει τὸ ἰσχνόν, καὶ τοῖς περὶ θείων πραγμάτων λόγοις τὸ ἀπέριτον καὶ αὐτοφύες καὶ ἀαλλώπιστον, “the plain style is appropriate for the dialectical investigations, and the unpretentious, natural and simple for the dialogues about divine things”, and Σ Hesiod, *Op.*, *Prolegom.* Ab.1, p. 2.4–5 Pertusi τὸ γὰρ ἀπλοῦν καὶ τὸ αὐτοφύες πρέπει τοῖς ἠθικοῖς λόγοις, “for the simple and natural style fits speeches on ethics”).

¹⁷⁴ Reitzenstein (1931) 25–40; the differences between the Callimachean and the rhetorical uses of this word should of course not be ignored: see Asper (1997) 178–179.

¹⁷⁵ E.g. *Anecd. Estense* III, p. 11.22–30 Wendel; implicitly also in the *Prolegomena*, section D, p. 5.2–6; cf. Wendel (1920) 55–56. *gracilis*, which Virg. *Ecl.* 10.71 clearly uses to characterise his own poetry (cf. also Prop. 2.13.3; *Culex* 1), is employed by Varro to render *ἰσχνός* in the rhetorical sense, cf. *ThLL* 6.2132.26–50.

¹⁷⁶ That Virgil’s use of *tenuis* and similar terms does not point mainly to Calli-

Furthermore, the recognition of a poetological characteristic of bucolic poetry in the present passage of *Id.* 9 also suggests itself because, in the model passage from *Id.* 7, Simichidas receives the χορὺνα with a statement that can be seen as a bucolic poet's fundamental vow of 'modesty' and of distance from the Homeric grand epic (particularly *Id.* 7.47–48).¹⁷⁷

The strongest genre awareness is displayed by the poet of the *Epitaph for Bion*, who stylises both himself and his teacher as herdsmen and, through the teacher-student relation, alludes to a genre tradition. The text, however, most of all makes use of a very important method for establishing one's belonging to a genre: the demarcation from other genres. This is effected by the contrast with Homer in which the two poetic springs (Hippocrene and Arethusa, l. 77) and the various objects of poetry are being confronted with one another (ll. 70–89). Through its rural and erotic subject-matter, the genre here is demarcated from heroic epic more clearly than ever before.¹⁷⁸ It is remarkable that linked to this particularly prominent genre awareness is the view of personal inferiority to Bion, the unsurpassed teacher, after whose death all gifts of the Muses had died (l. 65) and who can only effect his return from the underworld by means of his own song (ll. 118–120).¹⁷⁹

machus, but rather to a lost commentary on Theocritus which already contained the assignment of bucolic poetry to the γένος ἰσχνόν, is disputed by Schmidt (1972) 22–23.

¹⁷⁷ Cf. Hunter (1999) *ad loc.*, mainly with reference to the diminutive μελὺδριον (l. 51), which Lycidas employs a little later to describe his own song. Meleager, too, may also be having a poetological meaning of αὐτοφνῆς in mind, when he *AP* 7.195.3 = *HE* 4060 calls the cricket αὐτοφνῆς μύμημα λύρας. As Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 177–178 has shown, its song appears in this epigram as part of a bucolic atmosphere which provides an alternative to the emotionally harrowing experience of love; Fantuzzi refers to the characterisation of the cicada in the comparable epigram by Meleag. *AP* 7.196.2 = *HE* 4067 (ἀγρονόμαν ... μούσαν ἐρημιόλαον, "rustic Muse of those who dwell in solitary places") as "a clear metaphor for pastoral poetry". Cf. above p. 199.

¹⁷⁸ This is not affected by the accurate observation of Paschalis (1995a) that the depiction of Homer and his poetry in the *Epitaph for Bion* is "erotically tinted" by its context. On the differentiation of bucolic poetry from heroic epic cf. later particularly *Virg. Ecl.* 6.3–4a.

¹⁷⁹ Hubbard (1998), 43–44.

7. *Conclusions*

The state in which post-Theocritean bucolic poetry survives makes it difficult for us to arrive at a concluding overall view: to a large extent we are faced with fragments which provide us with insufficient information about form and content of the complete texts, and even in the case of complete texts we do not know whether they originally stood in the context of collections which would shed a different light on them today. Were these, for example, accompanied by urban mimes as we also find them in the works of Theocritus, in which later collectors simply were not interested? In that case, the reception of Theocritus may perhaps not have been as limited to bucolic poetry as it seems today.

But even on the basis of what little survives today it is possible to establish a great wealth of forms: thus, for example, the striving for formal proximity to Theocritean bucolic poetry greatly varies (which, as we know, is also the case in Virgil's *Eclogues*): it is strongest in *Id.* 8 and 9, which contain songs by herdsmen, and weakest in Bion's fr. 10, in which narrative dominates. It becomes clear that post-Theocritean poetry does by no means display the levelling-out of Theocritean complexity of which it is often accused without differentiation (and in other areas apparently not without justification).¹⁸⁰ In the adoption—which may come as a surprise to the reader—of models and their combination in, as far as we can see, novel ways, a technique of Theocritus is continued, whose *Id.* 7 can be recognised as, e.g., combining the narrative technique of Plato's *Phaedrus* (to which it is also thematically linked) to that of the *Lysis* or the *Republic*.¹⁸¹ This line of tradition helps us to understand how we can find signs of an increasing awareness of form and genre amidst all heterogeneity.

On the level of content, central topics of Theocritean bucolic poetry are being continued. As a general tendency we can observe the abatement of various tensions and contrasts that had been characteristic of Theocritus' bucolic poetry: between nature and man, who in the pathetic fallacy, as it were, are finally united; between the world of herdsmen and the world of myth; but mainly between the world of the herdsmen and the world of the author and his audience, who come closer to each other particularly as the depiction of bawdy and unpleas-

¹⁸⁰ Cf. van Sickle (1976) 24.

¹⁸¹ Hunter (1999) 145.

ant aspects of the world of herdsmen is given up while herdsman and poet are increasingly identified; these represent a crucial preparation for the inclusion of contemporary history in Virgil, but also for his treatment of subjective love elegy in *Ecl.* 10. But even where Theocritean contrasts remain strong—as, e.g., between bucolic peace and the experience of love—poignancy is greatly diminished.¹⁸²

¹⁸² English translation from German by J. Hanink, T.D. Papangelis, and A. Ruppel.

CONTINUITY AND CHANGE IN GREEK BUCOLIC BETWEEN THEOCRITUS AND VIRGIL

JOSEPH D. REED

1. *The origins of late bucolic*

Although ancient Greek sources name only two “bucolic poets” after Theocritus—Moschus of Syracuse and Bion of Smyrna¹—the Theocritean manuscripts and other sources preserve a considerable body of poetry like theirs.² First, there are the excerpts attributed to the two later poets in anthologies, primarily that of Stobaeus (Moschus has three, of between 8 and 13 lines; Bion 17, of between one and 18 lines). Moschus’ 30-line *Fugitive Eros* (“Moschus 1” in modern editions) is found in the *Greek Anthology* (AP 9.440) as well as in Stobaeus and some Theocritean manuscripts.³ Secondly, a few manuscripts of Theocritus append a number of poems that are unascribed, or ascribed to Theocritus but demonstrably not by him. At least one of these, titled *Epitaph for Adonis*, is almost certainly the work of Bion. The others of the type—to cite by the spurious attributions that have accrued to them since the early printed editions and by the titles they bear in the manuscripts⁴—are [Moschus] 3 (*Epitaph for Bion*), [Bion] 2 (*Epithalamium of Achilles and Deidameia*), and [Theocritus] 19 (*The Honeycomb Thief*), 20

¹ This bucolic triad is attested by *Suda* θ 166 Adler (s.v. Θεόκριτος) and the Palatine corrector on AP 9.440 (= Moschus 1), in P. Waltz and G. Soury, *Anthologie grecque* VIII (Paris 1974) 43. Cf. Servius, *praef. ad Ecl.*: *intentio poetae haec est, ut imitetur Theocritum Syracusanum, meliorem Moscho et ceteris qui bucolica scripserunt*. We know the name of one further writer of Greek bucolic: the Roman M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus ([Virg.] *Cat.* 9.13–20 = *SH* 558A, where *Cecropio* = “Greek”). He is probably too late to have written any of our texts, but attests an interesting continuation of the tradition.

² These texts are commonly edited together with Theocritus, as in Gow’s Oxford text.

³ Moschus’ fragments and *Fugitive Eros* await a proper commentary. For Bion see Reed (1997). Arland (1937) is to date the only book-length study of post-Theocritean Greek bucolic.

⁴ The titles, which in some cases are ill-fitting rhetorical labels (e.g. the *Epitaph for Adonis*, ἐπιτάφιος Ἀδωνίδος), are unlikely to go back to the authors.

(*The Little Herdsman*), 23 (*The Lover*), and 27 (*The Lovers' Talk*).⁵ There is some reason to think that this group of poems entered the Theocritean manuscript tradition as an originally independent collection.⁶

All of these texts can be very roughly dated by internal or external evidence to the century between 150 and 50 BC. Moschus, who was a pupil of the grammarian Aristarchus (*Suda* μ 1278 Adler: Ἀριστάρχου γνῶριμος) must have flourished around the mid 2nd century BC.⁷ Verbal parallels between Bion and later poets in the *Garland of Meleager* may indicate a date before 100 for the former.⁸ Bion's *Epitaph for Adonis* and the *Epitaph for Bion* are imitated by Catullus,⁹ who thus sets a *terminus post quem non* in the 50s BC for both Bion and his anonymous eulogist. Catullus also seems to imitate [Theocritus] *Id.* 20 and 23, which in turn seem to follow Bion.¹⁰ The metrical and linguistic style of the remaining anonymous poems, in allying itself to that of Moschus and Bion, fits their authors into the same ample timeframe.

Collectively I will term this poetry "late bucolic". Its exemplars share a Homeric dialect tinged with conventional Doricisms; a refined, post-

⁵ [Moschus] 3 and [Bion] 2 need full commentaries; for now see Mumprecht (1964) on the former and Valpuesta Bermúdez (1990) on the latter. Gow (1952) covers *Id.* 19, 20, 23, and 27; for more recent studies see Trovati (2001) and Bernsdorff in this volume. Papyrological discoveries have added only *SH* 902 (PHamb. II.201), a very fragmentary hexameter poem with evident dialectal and thematic affinities to bucolic.

⁶ Wilamowitz (1906) 69–84, Matthews (1994) 25–51, Reed (1997) 65–69.

⁷ See Porro (1999). The canonical list "Theocritus, Moschus, Bion" (*Suda* θ 166 Adler) presumably reflects chronological order; the Palatine corrector on *AP* 9.440 describes Theocritus as "first", Moschus as "second", and Bion as "third" among authors of "the poems called 'bucolic.'" Cf. Bücheler (1875) 30, Arland (1937) 63–64.

⁸ Reed (1997) 58–59.

⁹ Catull. 3 and *Epitaph for Adonis*: Casadio (1986/87), Hunter (1994)—but the most trenchant discussion is in McCulloh's unpublished paper. Catull. 5.5–6 *nobis cum semel occidit brevis lux / nox est perpetua una dormienda* reproduces not just the basic idea but the syntax, the metaphor, and the tricolon of modifiers of [Moschus] 3.103–104 ὁπότε πρῶτα θάνωμες, ἀνάχοι ἐν χθονὶ κοῖλα / εὕδομες εὖ μάλα μακρὸν ἀτέρμονα νήγητον ὕπνον, "when once we have died, unheeding in the hollow earth / we sleep a very long, unending, unwaking sleep".

¹⁰ Khan (1967) 616–618 plausibly finds echoes of [Theocr.] *Id.* 20 in Catull. 99. *Id.* 23.19–20 ἄγριε παῖ καὶ στυγνέ, κακᾶς ἀνάθρεμμα λεαίνας, / λάνιε παῖ, "cruel boy, and pitiless, nursling of the savage lioness, stone-hearted boy" may be imitated by Catull. 60 *num te leaena ... tam mente dura procreavit ac taetra ... a nimis fero corde?*, "Surely not did a lioness ... beget you with a mind so hard and vile ... with your heart too cruel?" (Trovati (2001) 44); the similarly used lioness at Theocr. 3.15–16 is further from the Catullan context and phrasing. *Id.* 23 and [Bion] 2 were known to Ovid: see Copley (1956) 138–139 on *Met.* 14.698–761 and Hollis on *Ars am.* 1.681–704.

Callimachean style of hexameter; and, more broadly, a similar vocabulary and repertory of subjects, among which love is prominent. Their formal features as well as certain occasional themes (e.g. pastoral) and structural elements (e.g. the dialogue or monologue) point back to the tradition of Theocritus; their diverse matter, as well as their variety of structural forms, represents their authors' originality or claim to a new place in the tradition. In what follows I accept the invitation offered by the common formal features and repetitions of words and motifs among these poems to read them together, and against the background of Theocritus' poetry. A different criterion—pastoral or rustic themes, for example—would yield a different collection, a different story, and a different lineage.¹¹ To distinguish in terminology the different lines of influence converging in this poetry and the different traditions it perpetuates, I use "bucolic" for the group united by formal features and "pastoral" for themes of herdsmen and rustic life (the two often overlap, but not invariably).¹² My terminology takes advantage of the thematic associations of "pastoral" and the apparent looseness with which ancient writers used *boukolikos*. Ancient instances of the label do not harmonize to suggest a consistent differentiating perspective. In Theocritus' own work the term and its cognates refer only to pastoral and musical activity within the fiction.¹³ The *Suda*'s account of Theocritus' work simply refers to "the hexameter poems in Doric dialect that are called 'bucolic'" (*Suda* θ 166 Adler τὰ καλούμενα βουκολικά ἔπη Δωριδί διαλέκτῳ). Attempts to pin it down further—for example on thematic grounds—tend to become circular; its application to the mostly Ionic, mythological narrative *Id.* 13, for example, suggests that it could be used of any poem written by a writer who for some reason could justifiably be called bucolic.¹⁴

Each late bucolic poem works out its own relationship to Theocritus' poetry, particularly his dramatic hexameter poems in Doric-colored epic dialect, among which those dealing with pastoral subjects are espe-

¹¹ On pastoral themes in pre-Hellenistic and non-bucolic Hellenistic poetry see Egger (1867) 242–268, Bernsdorff (2001).

¹² Thus, for example, Moschus' mythological narrative *Europa* (his most substantial surviving work) is not "bucolic" by these criteria; it perpetuates other traditions, notably epic.

¹³ See the refrains in Theocr. 1, and 1.20; 5.44, 60; 7.36, 49.

¹⁴ Σ Apoll. Rhod. 1.1236; cf. on 1289. Cf. Halperin (1983a) 125–126 and, for the generic use of *boukolikos* independent of pastoral (in the thematic sense) criteria, *passim*, though his application is broader than the one employed here.

cially conspicuous models; therefore it is worth first reviewing how readily Theocritus' own synthesis, now long accepted as a unity under different names and formulations (particularly "pastoral" or "bucolic"), analyses itself from the perspective of earlier poetic norms. The poems of Theocritus that show the clearest affinities to the later bucolic tradition—*Id.*¹⁵ 1–6, 10, 14–15—cohere as a unity in some respects, in others not. They typically show bantering dialogue on everyday situations between heavily characterized persons of the ordinary classes, or highly contextualized monologues by a single character (in tone sometimes with humor or incongruity, sometimes with poignancy or sentimentality). These are features of comic drama, and particularly of the popular dramatic form of mime.¹⁶ The scholia cite models for *Id.* 2 and 15 from among the literary mimes of the 5th-cent. Sophron of Syracuse.¹⁷ These mimes in epic metre have a close formal parallel in the *Mimiamb*s of Theocritus' contemporary Herodas, mimes done into the iambic metres of Archaic invective poetry, and attest a general interest among the poets of the time in mixing literary features, particularly in a piquant combination of the high and the low. Hellenistic hybridization of genres (Kroll's well-known formulation) never went further than Theocritus' mime-like poems in apt, imitable synthesis of seemingly disparate forms and traditions.

Thematically this group shows both rural and urban settings; across this division cut others. Among the pastorals, one shared theme (herdsmen) overlays a variety of dramatic forms (for example, monologue in *Id.* 3, dialogue in 4, dialogue involving a song in 1, and dialogue involving a singing contest in 5; *Id.* 7 is a kind of reminiscence, more complicated dramatically and thematically). Likewise among the mimes set in town *Id.* 2 is a monologue, 14 a dialogue, and 15 a full drama that moves through the streets of Alexandria from a bourgeois house to the royal palace and includes a festival hymn. Neither dialect nor

¹⁵ The term εἰδύλλιον "idyll", referring to poems by and attributed to Theocritus (and by extension to poems by other bucolic poets), is apparently of late application; see Gow (1952) vol. 1, lxxi–lxxii, Thomas (1996) 232 n. 15, and *Der neue Pauly* s.v. "Eidyllion" (M. Fantuzzi). See however, Breed, this volume, p. 354.

¹⁶ This influence was discussed by Kroll (1924) 203–204 in his influential discussion of the *Kreuzung der Gattungen* as a hallmark of Hellenistic poetry. On the connection of mime and Sicilian comedy with Theocritus' dialogues and other Hellenistic poetry see already Hartung (1858) xxvii.

¹⁷ Wendel (1914) 269–270, 272, 305 (see Sophron, *PCG* 3–10); cf. Gow (1952) vol. 2, 33–35. Rural themes emerge in Sophron's *The Fisherman to the Countryman*: *PCG* 42–44, 96.

metre, among formal features, unites one thematic group against the other; Doric admixture and metrical refinement both vary from poem to poem within the dramatic idylls. Other influences serve both to unite the group and to distinguish its members from one another. The death of the legendary herdsman-poet Daphnis, the subject of a composition by the 4th-cent. lyric poet Stesichorus,¹⁸ is the topic of the goatherd Thyrsis' song in *Id.* 1 and again of a song-within-a-song in *Id.* 7.72–77. The influence of recent lyric draws another of Theocritus' poems into our dramatic group: *Id.* 11, whose centerpiece is the lovelorn Cyclops Polyphemus' address to the sea nymph Galatea, uses a myth first treated by Philoxenus around 400 BC (*PMG* 815–824), framing it with a commentary in the author's own person.¹⁹ Both Daphnis and Polyphemus are "Sicilian"; both are herdsmen. *Id.* 11 is pastoral in theme, but, as against the Greek poetic tradition, is doing different things with that theme than, say, the mime-like *Id.* 1, 3, 4, or 5.

We should not wish to privilege any one feature of Theocritus' poetry as the criterion that distinguishes a selection of his texts as comprising one genre at the price of enforcing identity within that selection. *Id.* 11's affinities with and differences from the pastoral mimes has just been noted. Richard Thomas, illustrating his own destabilization of generic categories within the Theocritean corpus, offers a fruitful reading of *Id.* 22 (a hymn to Castor and Polydeuces) against the pastoral mimes.²⁰ The example I choose (partly because of its closeness to the characteristic themes of late bucolic) is *Id.* 2, in which a certain Simaetha, a town-dweller, casts a love-spell on her dilatory lover, Delphis. This poem, with its apparently unsupervised girl living alone with a slave able to serve as go-between to Delphis, is as much a fantasy-version of reality as any of the pastoral idylls (whose characters are more commonly occupied with song or conversation than with

¹⁸ West (1970) 206 (this is not the 6th-cent. lyric poet, though the composition is ascribed to him as *PMGF* 279–280). He was active around 370–368 according to the Parian Marble (*FGrHist* 239A73). Other early 3rd-cent. authors treat this myth in a variety of literary forms: elegy (Hermesianax, *CA* 2; Alex. Act. *CA* 15), historiography (Timaeus, *FGrHist* 566F83), drama (Sositheus, *TrGF* 99F1a). On Daphnis' appearance in epigram see Rossi (2001).

¹⁹ Other dithyrambs apparently on Polyphemus and Galatea were composed by Stesichorus (see n. 18 above) and Timotheus: Didymus on Demosthenes, col. 12.59–62 Pearson-Stephens. As with Daphnis, contemporaries of Theocritus treat this myth too in different literary forms: elegy (Hermes. *CA* 1), epic (Callim. fr. 378 Pfeiffer), epigram (Callim. *AP* 12.150 = *HE* 1047ff.).

²⁰ Thomas (1996) 233–238.

the work of herding). The themes that are prominent in some of the pastorals—and that critics tend to take as essential to “the pastoral”—also emerge here, reworked in special ways. The intertextual reader can compare Simaetha to Medea—as a witch and as a lovelorn heroine—just as he or she can compare the *ekphrasis* of the cup in *Id.* 1 with the Iliadic *ekphrasis* of Achilles’ shield: both comparisons suggest a translation from the heroic register to the everyday. This is a translation common to much of Theocritus’—and his contemporaries’—poetry (Halperin (1983a) makes it the basis for his understanding of “bucolic”). A generic reading that distinguishes urban from pastoral setting would miss a lot here.

Simaetha is a kind of poet, in so far as her spell—and her interwoven narrative—is analogous to poetry. We find connections with the Cyclops’ idyll: *eros* is a disease with a cure (l. 95 *μᾶχος*), and this cure is a spell (ll. 159–161)—just as poetry cures the Cyclops’ passion.²¹ The presiding deities, the Moon and Hecate, are special to her situation, as the herdsmen typically invoke the rural Nymphs and Pan. At ll. 140–141 the narrative of the origin of her love reaches its climax with the consummation: “And soon skin warmed against skin, and our faces were hotter than before, and we murmured sweetly (*καὶ ἐψιθυρίσομεν ἄδύ*)”.²² The last phrase, of course, is that which begins *Id.* 1, where it is tied closely to the poetic program of the speakers: “Something sweet is the murmuring (*ἄδύ τι τὸ ψιθύρισμα*), goatherd, that the pine tree by the spring makes in its music, and sweet also is your piping”. The verb (in our manuscripts anyway) even shows the bucolic -σδ-, indicative of Doric dialect, that, as Teresa Molinos Tejada argues,²³ signalled rusticity and became conventional for bucolic mainly in words dealing with music and romantic leisure, like *συρίσδω* (“play the panpipe”) and indeed *βουκολιάσδω* (“play herdsmen’s songs”). The meaning that the phrase has in each idyll neatly ironizes that which it has in the other. The harmony that the opening of *Id.* 1 establishes between human song and natural “music”, for example, if read into *Id.* 2, resonates against Simaetha’s sense of her love as part of nature—the nature that her magic is invok-

²¹ It is noteworthy in this connection that Callimachus (*AP* 12.150.1 = *HE* 1047) bridges the ideas of “song” and “cure” in Polyphemus’ song by calling it an *ἐπαιοῖδά*, “spell”. On these ideas cf. Faraone, this volume, pp. 75ff.

²² ἄδύ is the reading of the majority of manuscripts, including the older ones; the oldest witness, PAntinoe, has *ἦδη* (“we murmured already”, conceivably a spelling error), and one manuscript has *ἄει* (“we murmured continually”).

²³ Molinos Tejada (1990) 129–131.

ing and trying to manipulate. The theme of reciprocal desire, on the other hand, that the phrase carries in *Id.* 2 raises, in *Id.* 1, a theme very much a part of the latter poem, that of the contrast between harmonious nature (in the frame) and the terrible *eros* endured by Daphnis in the inset song. If we let one poem read or interpret the other, an apt mutual commentary results.

2. *The thematic variety of late bucolic*

Theocritus' *Id.* 7 is unlike his other pastorals. A single narrative voice (that of Simichidas, a town-dweller), unmoored from any particular addressee, reminisces about just such a scene of rustic competition and leisure as the mime-like poems set; the link with dramatic form—with mime—is broken, and the boundary between narrator and author is threatened by the intrusion of Alexandrian literary concerns into the fictional world. As against the rest of Theocritus, the poem tempts us to read it as a reflection back on the problems implicit in the pastoral mimes: "What this poem does is constantly to reflect on its own composition and, more generally, on the problem of *mimêsis*. What is the relationship between poetry and life? How can personal experience be accommodated to the conventions of a particular poetic genre? How can real persons appear in bucolic poetry?"²⁴ Here, one is tempted to conclude, the poet realized the possibilities of the thematic constructions he is dealing with, and how he could make something special of them apart from the mime-form. But to take *Id.* 7 as the consummation of a genre is to misread the literary tradition. In structure, it stands alone. Instead we get, soonest after Theocritus' work (or at least most like it, and usually assumed to be near-contemporary imitations), *Id.* 8 and 9.²⁵ Metrical style, to name one formal feature, separates those two from the ones we are designating as late bucolic, so they are probably earlier than the time of Moschus; their use of the poetic traditions shows a phase after Theocritus. These poems isolate and normalize certain elements of Theocritus' idylls; they use his combinations of tra-

²⁴ Williams (1992) 548.

²⁵ For a recent discussion see Fantuzzi (1998) on *Id.* 8's reflection of Theocritean bucolic. Similar to *Id.* 8 and 9 in formal structure, style, and use of the Theocritean background is *Id.* 21, a dialogue between two fishermen framed by moralizing commentary.

ditions as givens, and in their turn innovate on them in creative new ways. Prologues and epilogues frame their pastoral dialogues. Daphnis is used differently: *Id.* 8.92–93 still makes him the legendary, almost supernatural figure inherited from 4th-cent. lyric (as in *Id.* 1 and 7), but both poems represent him only as a young herdsman like the ones who sing *of* Daphnis, and of other topics, in Theocritus' pastoral mimes—only more idealized, with less emphasis on rustic particularities.

The next (and last) phase that we discern, the one I am calling late bucolic, offers its own reading of the tradition. Formal features like poetic Doric dialect, hexameters, and incidence of pastoral themes point up a retrospection to Theocritus' poetry—as do also, of course, at the level of the line or phrase, their frequent verbal echoes of Theocritus. The style of the poems' formal features, however, departs from Theocritean usage. The hexameter style is closer to the greater refinement of Callimachus (with more severe restrictions on the location of word-boundaries and a stronger tendency toward dactylic rhythm), and the Doric elements in the epic dialect are mostly confined to a few stock elements, recalling the token veneer of conventional Doric in some epigrams, or in Attic tragic choruses.²⁶ The rougher quality of Theocritus' metre (which at least in its proportion of dactyls to spondees, and their arrangement, is closer to the Homeric) does not necessarily comport with the unelevated matter; rather, it could point up the piquant incongruity of quotidian topics treated in a venerable measure. His element of literary Doric, on the other hand, which is richer than that of late bucolic and conveys from poem to poem much less of a uniform convention, does comport with the matter (the speakers are typically from Doric-speaking areas: cf. 15.87–95), and like it contrasts piquantly with the metre. Ancient commentators saw the dialect as mimetic, perhaps too positively (Theocritus' Doric is not systematic nor representative of an actual spoken dialect), but not without textual grounds.²⁷ Likewise, late bucolic tends to deemphasize the characters' personality and lowly status, making them more assimilable to the reader, easier to agree with or identify with (see especially the speakers of Moschus fr. 1 and Bion fr. 2, 5, 9, 10, 11—presumably, and in some cases demonstrably, rus-

²⁶ Metre: Reed (1997) 36–45, Trovati (2001) 53–54. Dialect: Reed (1997) 31–36, Trovati (2001) 55–58. On Theocritus' metre see Fantuzzi (1995b); on his Doric see Abbenes (1996).

²⁷ See, e.g., Σ Theocr., *Prolegom. Anecd. Est.* p. 7.8–10 Wendel.

tic characters).²⁸ As in the post-Theocritean *Id.* 8 and 9, this represents a development from consciousness of the pre-Theocritean background (in particular mime) to consciousness of Theocritus as a background (in which this development is partly prefigured in *Id.* 1 and 7).

In variety of theme and structure, late bucolic effloresces. Pastoral monologue or dialogue (like those in *Id.* 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9) represents perhaps the strongest strain in the surviving texts; indeed, that pastoral was remembered in particular connection with bucolic is shown by the habitual influence of bucolic poetry on other pastoral material, for example in Longus' echoes of Theocritus, or in the numerous epigrams that use a light Doric together with pastoral motifs drawn from hexameter bucolic poetry.²⁹ Many of the fragments of Moschus and Bion evidently come from pastoral dialogues or monologues. The only text of either poet that shows a dialogue-form is Bion fr. 2, an exchange on the seasons between Cleodamus and Myrson, naive and presumably rustic characters. The speaker of Bion fr. 5 speaks as an authority on crafting the panpipe—poetry might have been a theme here, as often in the Theocritean countryside. The speaker of Moschus fr. 1 compares the life at sea with life on land in favor of the latter; the topos may indicate a monologic reworking of Theocritus' own dramatic models (cf. Sophron's *The Fisherman to the Countryman* and Epicharmus' *Earth and Sea*).³⁰

The erotic element, already frequent in Theocritus' pastorals, predominates in late bucolic pastoral. The pastoral dramas in *Id.* 20 and 27 are concerned with amatory attempts—failed and successful, respectively. In the monologic *Id.* 20 a rustic youth complains that a city girl has spurned his kiss; in *Id.* 27³¹ a young herdsman named Daphnis (further detached from his legendary namesake than in *Id.* 8 and 9) has sex with a girl over her protests after (and during) a bantering exchange on love and marriage. The speaker of Bion fr. 11 is a countryman in love with a shepherd; the 8-line fragment is his prayer for light to the

²⁸ Reed (1997) 7–10.

²⁹ Rossi (2001) discusses this feature of the corpus of epigrams ascribed to Theocritus alongside the pastoral motifs of epigrams contemporary with him. Later readers (including Virgil) seem to have read Theocritus' poems in collections based on pastoral content: cf. Gow (1952) vol. 1, lxxviii–ix (on the order of the idylls in the papyri, which seem to group the pastoral ones together), Irigoin (1975) 27–44, Stephens, this volume, pp. 116–117.

³⁰ Arland (1937) 37. Sophron: see n. 17 above; Epicharmus, *PCG* 20–29.

³¹ For its dating with the other poems dealt with here—on internal, stylistic grounds—see Reed (1997) 30 n. 62, Trovati (2001) 47–48.

evening star as he goes to perform his *komos*. The speakers of Bion fr. 9 and 10 (in which details like the conventionally—since Theocritus’ *Id.* 7—pastoral name Lycidas and the terms βούτα, “herdsman,” and βουκολίασδον, “played herdsman’s songs”, warn us to imagine pastoral contexts for the now unframed first-person narration) both explain why they only sing of *eros*. Both of these fragments, with their fables or quasi-allegories of the Eros and Aphrodite, are far from the discourse of Theocritus’ herdsmen (who eschew mythological subjects apart from those special to the countryside and herding), but recall the unfortunately contextless Moschus fr. 2 and 3, amatory fables of rural (Pan, Echo) or at least Sicilian (Arethusa) deities. The departure from pastoral is more striking in Bion.

Bion fr. 12, which may have come from a pastoral setting,³² contains a catalogue of exemplary heroic partnerships: a more jarring, because more explicit, juxtaposition than the Theocritean combination of pastoral setting with heroic verse-form. Its effect is to be compared with that of [Bion] 2, the *Epithalamius of Achilles and Deidameia*, which inserts heroic material into a context of herdsman’s song, suffusing the narrative with *eros* (it is introduced as a “song of love”, μέλος ἐρωτικόν, at ll. 1–2). The poem follows the request of one herdsman for another’s song with a sort of “miniature epic”: the story of Achilles on Scyros, told with ironic distance and many a rhetorical flourish, and focusing on the amatory aspects of an epic tale. Puzzlement over why a miniature epic has been given a pastoral frame and Doric dialect should evaporate when, focusing on formal features as the markers of affiliation, we look at the *Epithalamius* rather as a bucolic poem containing a miniature epic. Here is no “hybridization of genres”, but a stark grafting, as the poem’s different generic components, miniature epic and herdsman-drama—both Hellenistic in origin, the product of earlier hybridization—separate clearly against the background of earlier poetry. A later, Latin parallel is the ps.-Virgilian *Dirae*: catalogic curse-poetry within pastoral monologue. Gentler than in [Bion] 2 is the difference between frame and inset performance in [Theocr.] *Id.* 27, whose last lines suggest that the preceding was a virtuoso piece requested of a shepherd (the first lines are lost). The division there is between two types of dialogue: regular pastoral exchange and stichomythic dialogue between pastoral characters.

³² Reed (1997) 51–52 and (2004) 37–38.

So much for pastoral. Late bucolic poems like Moschus 1 and [Theocritus] *Id.* 19 and 23—indistinguishable from the texts cited above so far as concerns metre, diction, dialect, and transmission—deal with erotic themes totally unconnected with the countryside and introduce new generic affinities. Late bucolic poetry sometimes becomes a sub-species of the post-Classical tradition that includes the love epigram and the *Anacreontea*.³³ In the fragments of Bion and Moschus, as well as in the transmitted late bucolic idylls, epigrammatic closure frequently punctuates what were probably extended speeches by herdsmen and other characters typical of bucolic poems. The fabulistic elements of Moschus fr. 2 and 3 and Bion fr. 9 and 10 also fall into this line. Compare an actual epigram by Moschus (*APlan.* 200), in which Eros, unwontedly taking up the work of a plowman, threatens to yoke Zeus himself—the bull that carried off Europa—if he withholds the rain.³⁴ *Id.* 23 can almost be read as an extended, compound erotic epigram, retailing a hyperbolic story of tragic love capped by an aphorism. It comprises a morose *paraklausithyron*, with a lovelorn monologue to the beloved, the suicide of the unsuccessful lover, and the revenge of Eros on the unresponsive boy, all framed by a moralizing narrator. A sepulchral epigram is actually embedded at 47–48. In one sense the poem translates the scene of Theocritus's *Id.* 3—a *paraklausithyron* monologue whose herdsman-protagonist threatens, if unsuccessful, to “fall down and die, and the wolves will eat me” (l. 52)—out of the Theocritean incongruity of the countryside and back into town where *paraklausithyra* normally belong.³⁵ It compensates for this thematic reduction, however, by its novel amalgamation of generic forms and tones.

Moschus 1 (*Fugitive Eros*), Bion fr. 13, and [Theocritus] *Id.* 19 (*The Honeycomb Thief*)—all whole poems, though relatively short—display the rhetorical structure of epigrams: all tell brief fables about Eros culminating in a witty turn or punch-line. Moschus' poem is largely a run of such punch-lines. It is an especially influential specimen of an influential tradition, found in various types of literature, whereby Eros' physical traits, one by one, are correlated to or piquantly contrasted with an aspect of his (or love's) nature: he has small hands,

³³ Cf. Fowler (1982) 195–202 on “Epigrammatic Modulation” in different genres.

³⁴ The idea of Eros' power over even Zeus goes back to Sophocles, *TrGF* 684.

³⁵ Cf. Trovati (2001) 42–43. On the poem see Copley (1940), Radici Colace (1971), Hunter (2002).

but shoots far, and so on.³⁶ Here the topos is couched in a speech by Aphrodite, advertising a reward (a kiss) for the return of Eros, who is represented as a fugitive slave. Bion fr. 14.4–7 couches the same topos in a reproachful prayer to Aphrodite. Bion fr. 13—a short narrative on a young bird-limer who mistakes Eros for a bird and unsuccessfully pursues him—shows heavy, though deeply occulted, influence from Moschus 1;³⁷ the ps.-Theocritean *Id.* 19—Eros, stung by a bee, repairs to Aphrodite for sympathy—does not, but is extremely close in structure to Bion fr. 13.³⁸ It transfigures the ingenuous boy of Bion fr. 13 into Eros himself and dramatizes his relationship to Aphrodite differently from Moschus 1, where Eros is her slave. In this respect the three poems represent successive stages in a trajectory of influence (probably, though of course not certainly, reflecting their relative dating).³⁹

Bion's *Epitaph for Adonis* (Bion 1) may present the most unexpected content and synthesis of features in all of extant late bucolic. It is a mimetic mythological narrative akin to Callimachus' mimetic hymns, and like them descended on one side from the festival odes of Archaic lyric.⁴⁰ The referent of Bion's representation, however, is removed two degrees from the reality of an Adonis festival: it is not the actual performance, nor the literary, constructed festival world of Callimachus' hymns, but the very mythological event the ritual commemorates (which thus becomes the tacit aetiology of the rite). The poet gains a kind of priority over other writers of such poems, as being closer to origins.⁴¹ A forerunner is Theocritus *Id.* 18, where the choral marriage ode

³⁶ There are literary examples in Eubulus, *PCG* 40, Antag. *CA* 1, Meleager, *AP* 5.177 = *HE* 4190ff. (with echoes of Moschus 1 and Bion fr. 9.1), *Met. and Parth.* col. II (*AGNF* pp. 85–89), Propertius 2.12, Chariton 4.7.6, Achilles Tat. 2.4.5. Hunter (1983b) 131–133 traces the motif back to 4th-cent. rhetoric and comedy.

³⁷ Allen (1956) 177: “the runaway Eros of Moschus, though still fugitive, appears as the mysterious center, unnamed by the *personae* but recognized by the poet, of Bion's idyll”.

³⁸ See Reed (1997) 11.

³⁹ The different treatments of Moschus 1 in Bion fr. 13 and [Theocr.] *Id.* 19, alongside their strong narrative similarities, make me back away from my earlier openness to Valckenaer's attribution of the latter to Bion (Reed (1997) 29–30). The style and substance of *The Honeycomb Thief* date it to the period of late bucolic; *Anacreont.* 35 is a later imitation.

⁴⁰ Reed (1997) 15–18. Particularly useful on the Hellenistic “mimetic” poem, one whose narrative dramatically simulates real-time events, are Albert (1988), Harder (1992), and Depew (1993). Callimachean examples are *Hymns* 2, 5, and 6.

⁴¹ In this regard the poem's impressionistic, disordering mode of narration (Reed

for Helen and Menelaus is aetiologically translated back to the mythological scene; more broadly comparable is the Hellenistic straining after full referentiality as evinced in Theocritus' *Id.* 28 (a poem as artfully wrought as the ivory distaff it describes and in a sense replaces⁴²), or in the dedicatory epigram. Bion fr. 1, four lines on Apollo's reaction to the death of Hyacinthus, may attest a like narrative poem on a cult-mythological topic; and Bion's putative (but not directly attested) poem on Orpheus⁴³ could have been similar. All three myths, it will be noticed, are about love ended by death. Involved in the *Adonis* is a lament by Aphrodite, not only hearkening back to the epic heroines' laments of *Iliad* 24, but to the quintessentially Hellenistic distressed heroine's soliloquy, derived in large part from Euripidean tragedy and perhaps exemplified best by Apollonius' *Medea* (Catullus' *Ariadne*, Virgil's *Dido* and *Juturna*, and many of Ovid's heroines provide Latin examples).

Retrospection to Theocritean bucolic, despite the divergent matter, is still evident in the metre and dialect of the *Epitaph for Adonis* and in its echoes of *Id.* 1 and 15.⁴⁴ Thyrsis' song on the death of Daphnis haunts Bion's *Adonis*. Verbal echoes of it abound, and its motifs reappear in the later poem: the lamentation of nature, the pageant of mourning deities, the attempt to bring back the deceased (compare Theocr. 1.138–140 with *Adon.epit.* 94–95). *Adonis* has been lifted into the spotlight from his two lines in Daphnis' speech (*Id.* 1.109–110), and the *Adonis*-song from *Id.* 15 (a hymeneal, not a dirge) has been re-formed by the lament from *Id.* 1.⁴⁵ But in effecting this imitation Bion has gutted his model of its significance. Daphnis dies by going "to the stream", and the water closes over his head (ll. 140–141); he defies *erôs* and melds with the natural world. "[T]he implication", notes Kathryn Gutzwiller,⁴⁶ "is that his dying to preserve closeness with nature has met with a semblance of success". Bion's *Adonis* meets with no such semblance

(1997) 17–18) might be seen as an obscuring of its literary debts.

⁴² Hopkinson (1988) 176.

⁴³ Skutsch (1901) 59–60, Knaack (1905), Reed (1997) 27 and (2004) 38–40.

⁴⁴ Reed (1997) 22. Theocr. *Id.* 1 and the *Epitaph for Adonis*: Porro (1988); Theocr. *Id.* 15 and *Epitaph*: Manakidou (1994), Gelzer (2002) 262. Gelzer (2002) 258 n. 14 and 264–265 also notes the model of Theocr. *Id.* 13 (on Hylas) at *Adon.epit.* 19–24 and elsewhere.

⁴⁵ For more fundamental connections between the figures of Daphnis and *Adonis* see Halperin (1983b). Aphrodite's plea for a last embrace and kiss from *Adonis* also recalls Theocr. 3.46–48, where Aphrodite cannot put the dead *Adonis* from her breast.

⁴⁶ Gutzwiller (1991) 100.

of success. He too “flows down” to death (l. 55), but there is horror in the merging. Unlike the feverish, defiant Daphnis, Adonis is a mute, senseless rag of a boy torn between two powerful goddesses, Aphrodite and Persephone. The annual return of Adonis to life, celebrated in Theocr. 15.143–149, is denied in this poem (l. 95), which ends with a promise of Aphrodite’s yearly lamentation (l. 98). Desire and death, in the persons of Adonis’ rivalrous captors, below the surface of the poem are doublets of the same annihilating force, which enjoys the subservience of a helpless natural world: the pretty sympathy of nature (ll. 31–39, 65–66, 76) from this perspective amounts to a mocking ineffectuality. Herein Bion’s poem is a rewriting not just of Thyrsis’ song, but of a whole bucolic tradition that elaborated Theocritean pastoral. Bion’s own fragments are part of this tradition; perhaps if more remained of them we could see how far the *Epitaph for Adonis* reverses a trend in his own work, or whether they implied a like commentary on earlier bucolic.

The *Epitaph for Bion* ([Moschus] 3) takes up Bion’s *Epitaph for Adonis* and fits it, along with his other productions, into a scheme of its own. This deeply complicated poem suffuses the epicedic form with the pastoral themes of bucolic, sounding every convention of the ancient epicedium in terms borrowed from Theocritus and from Bion himself. The refrain from Thyrsis’ song in *Id.* 1 is adapted here as “Begin, Sicilian Muses, begin the mourning”; the looser refrain of the *Epitaph* (“fair Adonis is dead”) is worked in sporadically, adapted to Bion himself. The mourning of the natural world, a topos from *Id.* 1 and the *Epitaph for Adonis*, is carried to an extreme, with plant and animal life, cities of men, deities of every description, and geographical features lamenting. Among its more original catachreses, honey is said to die in sympathy with Bion (l. 34).⁴⁷ Here the mourning is not only reported, but urged: from its first line (“Groan ‘ailina’ with me, O woodlands and Dorian water”) the poem casts the speaker, Bion’s heir, as an Orpheus-like figure (a role emphasized by the frequent references to the Orpheus myth, especially at ll. 115–119), projecting, at least, authority over nature. The uniting discourse of the poem is the self-conscious terminology of pastoral that will also appear in Virgil’s *Eclogues*: the Muses addressed in the refrain are “Sicilian,” bucolic poetry is “the Doric muse” (l. 96),

⁴⁷ A mannerism expanded from Bion’s *Epitaph for Adonis*: see Reed (1997) on *Adon.epit.* 12.

and so on, referring them back especially to Theocritus and his characters (Doric-speaking herdsmen, the Sicilian Cyclops).⁴⁸

The dead Bion becomes a character from his own kind of poetry, a poet-herdsman who “sang of Pan and of herdsmen and, singing, watched his herds, fashioned a panpipe and milked a sweet heifer, and taught the kisses of boys and nurtured Eros in his bosom and provoked Aphrodite” (ll. 80–84). The role of the poet is the common point between the two personae, real and fictional. Likewise the comparisons of Bion to Adonis, Hyacinthus, and Polyphemus certainly, and to Orpheus probably, go back to poems by Bion: in each reference the *Epitaph for Bion* compares a character with its maker. At the end of the poem (l. 125), where in an analogy with the last-named myth Bion becomes both subject and object of his song before Persphone, he is Eurydice and Orpheus combined. In considering this trope we might recall that “ancient biographers took most of their information about poets from the poets’ own works” on the creative fallacy “that every creative act must have grounding in a particular experience”.⁴⁹ In the bucolic pastoral tradition, however, it has a special meaning. There is a strong analogy with the typical reading of *Id.* 7, a poem that invites us to read Simichidas as just such a poet as Theocritus himself was, emulous of real Greek poets like Philetas and Asclepiades, and attuned to the poetic doctrines of contemporary Alexandria (ll. 37–41). Later bucolic furthers this tendency by different structural means: at the end of the ps.-Theocritean *Id.* 9 a second fictionalizing frame appears, as the narrator who frames the pastoral dialogue suddenly emerges as a practitioner of rustic song himself. The last two lines of *Id.* 27 tell a shepherd to take his panpipe back before “we turn our attention to another song”—the dialogue (framed with narrative at the end) that constitutes the bulk of the poem as we have it is evidently the performance of a herdsman-singer for another herdsman. The trope reappears in Artemidorus’ epigram on his early collection of bucolic poetry (*AP* 9.205 = *FGE* 113–114), where the *editor* is likened to a herdsman. It becomes very complicated, and the lines between real and fictional worlds irremediably blurred, in Virgil’s *Eclogues*, where, for example, poems that one might have thought narrated by Virgil him-

⁴⁸ The Orpheus-characterization reinforces the assimilation of both the lamenter and Bion to Daphnis, who in one part of the tradition appears as an Orpheus-type: Rossi (2001) 176–177.

⁴⁹ Lefkowitz (1981) viii.

self turn out to be by herdsmen-characters (*Ecl.* 5.85–87), and where the herdsmen-poet Tityrus speaks to a Roman nobleman, Varus, as to a literary patron (*Ecl.* 6.10).

This is about the troping of author as character, fiction as reality. Gérard Genette discusses the figure of the “author’s metalepsis”, the pretense that the poet himself brings about an effect that he is narrating (that is, participates in—is subject of—the narration), as a transgression of diegetic boundaries.⁵⁰ The *Epitaph for Bion*, using enframing tropes of impersonation to subsume a precursor into his own fiction, contrives an extreme of this figure (carrying it even further than in *Id.* 9), which here recreates that whole fiction in a new image. We should not make the mistake of reading this poem as a reliable window into an agreed-upon bucolic genre, nor automatically read the conventions it encodes into other late bucolic poems. It creates a view of the tradition suitable first and foremost to its own purposes, however readable against other late bucolic poetry. The anonymous eulogist’s self-analogy to Bion is ambivalent and suggests the inevitable mixture of identity and change in a poetic transmission. He wavers between claiming to be Bion’s successor (e.g. ll. 93–97), and announcing that with Bion all “Doric song” has died (e.g. ll. 11–12). In the final section he introduces the idea that he himself, like Orpheus, might go to the Underworld to sing to ransom Bion, but immediately suppresses it by switching the topic to Bion’s own music-playing (l. 118): Bion now becomes like Orpheus. The last lines, 125–126, reintroduce a hint of the first analogy—but in a denial (a contrary-to-fact condition): “if my piping could avail aught ...”. This denial that he is a poet with the powers of Orpheus—or Bion—casts doubt not only on his ability to command the natural world as he began the *Epitaph* by doing, but on his figurative place, as Bion’s heir, in the poetic world in which he locates Bion.⁵¹

This metalepsis of Bionean poetry is a translation in which some elements are retained, others lost, under a new perspective. We are in the realm of the “do-it-yourself literary tradition”.⁵² Each late bucolic poem reenvisions its inheritance in its own way; the *Epitaph for Bion* (being on the death of a precursor) only does it most explicitly. In the aggregate and individually, they redefine their genre by embodying different perspectives on their models, since a genre comprises less a

⁵⁰ Genette (1980) 234–236.

⁵¹ Cf. Hubbard (1998) 43–44.

⁵² See Hinds (1998), esp. 123–129.

particular view on life than a perspective that brackets some parts of the literary tradition off from other parts; the question of how exactly those texts, and that selection (or projection), refer to life is deferred. This is the principle with which we begin the last section, which investigates what late bucolic does with certain Theocritean themes. A synecdochic understanding of genre would read the meaning of one poem into the others with which it shares generic criteria; we should rather step back and read this synecdoche as the effort of the text itself, a rhetorical act in which one text more or less tendentiously highlights features it has in common with other texts. We had better focus on the rhetoric between texts, and attend to the differences between them as much as to the similarities that bind them together.⁵³

3. *Late bucolic variations on death and desire*

Bion's 18-line fr. 2 is a dialogue about which season is best, and a few of his and Moschus' shorter fragments (as we have them) show only non-erotic themes; otherwise, all of late bucolic is about *eros*. In their deeper poetics, in fact, the *eros* presented by these texts is involved with thoughts on death and immortality: the thematics of a heavy poetic consciousness. This is an epigonal poetry—indeed, a poetry that reformulates epigonality and the debt to a poetic past (most overtly in the *Epitaph for Bion*). This last part of the present study attempts to sketch some of the terms of the dialogue within late bucolic as much as it attends to the one those poems collectively or individually conduct with earlier poetry. Here we approach a sense of “genre” as discourse, which permits us to treat the poems both as historical, diachronic tradition and as rhetorical, linguistic construct.⁵⁴ Late bucolic poems offer arguments and responses to one another's ideas and provocations, especially about desire, death, and poetry. We are reading these poems and fragments intertextually, with a view to how they treat one another's ideas, whatever their relative chronology;

⁵³ On the rhetorical or semantic nature of genre see esp. Jameson (1981) 106–107, Fowler (1982) 22 and *passim*; cf. Selden (1994).

⁵⁴ On genre as “the historically attested codification of discursive properties” (and the ideological consequences of that understanding) see Todorov (1976) 161–165. Pucci (1977) 29–34 has suggestive comments on discourse (and thus potentially genre) as an item in an exchange between poets, in which something is owed (“to whom?” being the question to be contested).

the chronological question will mostly be avoided since it cannot be answered with certainty (except for the dating of Moschus as evidently earlier than Bion—and the *Epitaph for Bion* presumably postdates Bion's death).⁵⁵

In fr. 9 Bion overtly makes poetry dependent on *eros*. The speaker, declaring that of all mortals and immortals he can only sing of Lycidas (a rustic *eromenos* also in Virgil, *Ecl.* 7.67) and Eros, begins with an explanatory mythological allegory (ll. 1–2):

Ταὶ Μοῖσαι τὸν Ἔρωτα τὸν ἄγριον ἢ φοβέονται
ἢ κ' θυμῷ φιλέοντι, καὶ ἐκ ποδὸς αὐτὸν ἔπονται

The Muses are either intimidated⁵⁶ by savage Eros or they love him heartily, and they follow in his train.

The basic idea was codified by Euripides, *TrGF* (61)F663 ποιητὴν δ' ἄρα / Ἔρως διδάσκει, κἄν ἄμουσος ἦ τὸ πρὶν (“so Eros/desire teaches one to be a poet, even if one was artless before”).⁵⁷ This image of love is derived ultimately from lyric;⁵⁸ in Hellenistic literature one thinks of the personifications endemic to the love epigram and the *Anacreontea*. Related is the motif of Love as teacher (as at Callim. fr. 67.1 Pfeiffer “Eros himself taught Acontius ... the art”), which is taken up in late bucolic first by Moschus fr. 3.7–8, where Eros, a “dangerous boy, evil-devising, teacher of dire lessons” (κῶρος δεινοθέτας κακομάχανος αἰνὰ διδάσκων), “teaches” the river Alpheus to dive under the sea so that he can reach Arethusa; and then, more meaningfully from the standpoint of poetics, by Bion fr. 10. Here the speaker, a

⁵⁵ *Id.* 20 and 23 probably come after Bion's *Epitaph for Adonis*, to judge from the phrases and images they share with that poem (Reed (1997) 59). On echoes between other late bucolic poems see Reed (1997) 28, 30. Compare also [Theocr.] 20.14 and [Bion] 2.18, both with θηλύνητο before the bucolic caesura; Theocr. 23.56 εἴματα πάντ' ἐμίανεν ἐφαβικά, “he sullied all his boyish garments” ~ 27.53 εἴματα καλὰ μιάινεις, “you sully the fine garments”; 23.59 shares with [Moschus] 3.43 the unusual verb ἵπταμαι (see Gow on the former passage).

⁵⁶ For φοβέομαι in the sense “be intimidated or cowed by, defer to” (the will or opinion of another) see Plato, *Crito* 47 c–d (where the verb expands upon ἐπεισθαι) and Cleanthes, *CA* 4 (cf. Cic. *De fin.* 3.2.7); it is used of one god's deference to another at *AGNF* p. 176.14–15 = PMich. inv. 5; Plutarch, *Ant.* 33.3, and Bion's own *Adon.epit.* 57. Valckenaer's emendations οὐ < ἢ and ἐκ θυμῷ δὲ φιλεῖντι < ἢ κ' θυμῷ φιλέοντι, which in any case suppose corruption of more into less common diction and a complex of paleographic assumptions, are thus unwarranted.

⁵⁷ Echoed in, e.g., Plato, *Symp.* 196e and Nicias, *SH* 566 (a response to Theocritus' *Id.* 11).

⁵⁸ Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 182 discusses the debt to Sappho in Bion's passage.

herdsman, is engaged by Aphrodite (in a dream) to teach music to Eros, but naturally succumbs to the lessons in amatory song that Eros teaches him, and forgets his former topics (exemplified by myths of the inventions of instruments, not all of them recognizably pastoral, by different gods) in favor of tales of the loves of mortals and immortals.⁵⁹

Alan Cameron sees in Bion fr. 9 a foreshadowing, if not the particular inspiration, of the Latin *recusatio*, the programmatic protest of inability to handle any but the lighter themes (often love).⁶⁰ The first instance of that topos, Virgil, *Ecl.* 6.1–12, is of course pastoral, with its speaker, the herdsman Tityrus, invoking his “Syracusan” verse; other examples, like Ovid’s *Am.* 1.1, employ Bionese personal memoirs about the god of love to get across a message of love-poetic competence and inability to achieve other themes. In Greek poetry outside of Bion only *Anacreontea* 23 offers a similar figure.⁶¹ Bion’s fr. 10, in fact, provides as good a precedent for the *recusatio*. But in contrast to the confidently stated theological truth of fr. 9 (with which fr. 10 conceivably stood in a dialogue between two herdsman on why each sings only about love), a dream is a most uncertain source of poetic authority. Even a god in a dream—the Muses, Eros—is not necessarily a real god. This motif in Bion fr. 10 reintroduces into the poetic investiture (perhaps especially vis-à-vis Callim. fr. 2 Pfeiffer = 2–3 Massimilla, the so-called “Somnium”) the uncertainty of the poetics of Hesiod’s pastoral Muses: ἴδμεν ψεῦδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτυμοῖσιν ὅμοια, “we know how to tell falsehoods that are like truth ...” (*Theog.* 27). And besides the dream-setting of fr. 10, the fragments differ in that the speaker of fr. 9 is overtly in love, and indeed asserts that only the lover can compose poetry and that this is universally true (l. 7); fr. 10 implicitly contradicts this claim and offers a different, unique explanation for the inability to compose any but love poetry. The common element is the power of the god of love. But Bion coins a variety of approaches to these themes. His remarkable fr. 8, a

⁵⁹ The conceit of Eros’ teaching the poet is again used in a programmatic context by Propertius 1.1.5 (*Amor*) *donec me docuit castas odisse puellas*. He does not include the element of the poet as teacher of love—which Ovid, in programmatic passages of his own (*Ars am.* 1.7–8, 17–18; see Hollis *ad loc.* on Ovid’s debt to Bion fr. 10), will use without the other conceit. Eros as initiatory director of love-poetic themes is found in *Am.* 1.1 (a revision of the use of Apollo at Callim. fr. 1.22 Pfeiffer = Massimilla and Virg. *Ecl.* 6.3).

⁶⁰ Cameron (1995) 456.

⁶¹ Fantuzzi (1994) 541–542.

self-examination by a poet who distinguishes severely between the labor of poetry and the “joys and merriment” of life (6 εὐφροσύναν καὶ χάματα), shows a surprising realignment, compared to fr. 9 and 10. If love is present here at all, poetry—far from depending on it—is inimical to it. Perhaps this is why the passage replaces the Muses as bestowers of poetry with Fate (fr. 8.2): while being fundamentally at odds with the doctrine of fr. 9, on the allegorical level this fragment does not disagree with it—as long as Fate, not the Muses, provides song.

The idea that Eros or *eros* prompts poetry, of course, is one half of the conceit associated with Theocritus’ *Id.* 11, on the Cyclops Polyphemos’ love for Galatea: passion instigates poetry, and poetry provides the cure for (burning, unrequited, destructive) passion, in the manner of a drug, or *pharmakon* (ll. 1, 17).⁶² The latter element appears in the earliest known treatment of the myth (Philoxenus, *PMG* 822) and in Callimachus’ treatment at *AP* 12.150 = *HE* 1047ff. Bion’s own fr. 3 deals neatly with both parts:

Μοῖσας Ἔρωσ καλέοι, Μοῖσαι τὸν Ἔρωτα φέροισιν.
 μολπὴν ται Μοῖσαι μοι αἰ ποθέοντι διδοῖεν,
 τὰν γλυκερὰν μολπὴν, τᾶς φάρμακον ἄδιον οὐδέν.

Let Eros call the Muses, let the Muses bear Eros. Let the Muses give me song while I forever desire, sweet song, than which no drug is sweeter.

But Bion’s own treatment of the Polyphemos theme in fr. 16 seems to have reversed the Theocritean trope, particularly the last phrase of the 4-line excerpt: τὰς δὲ γλυκείας / ἐλπίδας ὑστατίῳ μέχρῃ γήραος οὐκ ἀπολείψω, “I will not abandon my sweet hopes until uttermost old age”. No *pharmakon* is forthcoming, from song or elsewhere, at least at this point in the speech. Against this background fr. 3 (which may or may not be spoken by Bion’s Polyphemos) shows some ambiguity in “bear” (φέροισιν). In conformity to the traditional theme, the word will mean “bear away, remove”, and thus cure—but even this brief fragment provides enough context to make that meaning hard to establish, especially against αἰ ποθέοντι, “while I forever desire”. If φέροισιν means “bear up, allow [me] to tolerate”, the presumption is gravely changed from the Theocritean treatment: song brings no complete cure, but a balm of mere endurance. And the verb might in fact mean “carry to my beloved” (as in a *komos* or serenade), in which case the *pharmakon*

⁶² On the themes involved here and for parallel passages see Hunter (1999) on 11.1–6.

cures (it is hoped) not by removing the unrequited love, but by making it requited, and the reversal of the Theocritean force of the trope is complete.

Sometimes late bucolic entirely strips Polypheman song of its traditional significance. The *Epithalamius* ([Bion] 2), in its programatically bucolic opening recalling that of Theocritus' *Id.* 1, makes the Cyclops story paradigmatic:

Λῆς νύ τί μοι, Λυκίδα, Σικελὸν μέλος ἄδῃ λιγαίνειν,
ἱμερόεν γλυκύθυμον ἔρωτικόν, οἷον ὃ Κύκλωψ
ἄεισεν Πολύφαμος ἐπ' ἄνι <τᾷ> Γαλατεία;

Would you like to sing me a sweet Sicilian song, Lycidas—desirous, heart-pleasing, amatory—such as the Cyclops Polyphemus sang to Galatea above the shore?

The request accepted, Lycidas is told to sing the myth of Achilles and Deidamea on Scyros. In what kind of a situation, one feels invited to ask, would Polyphemus have sung this, and with what effects? No *pharmakon* for desire seems to be at issue here, nor is the idea that love causes poetry pressed or even raised. The chosen myth has to do with persuasion: Achilles' persuasion of Deidamea (which unfortunately breaks off in mid-speech in our manuscripts), and by implication Polyphemus' persuasion of Galatea. Other analogies suggest themselves: as Achilles and Deidamea produced Neoptolemus and the various important Hellenistic nations and dynasties that claimed descent from him, so Polyphemus and Galatea, in the version that made his seduction successful, produced Galatus, the eponym of Galatia⁶³—but this consideration may have been in the far background. The point now is that the analogy at the beginning of the poem raises only the hoped-for success of the Cyclops, not the traditional themes. Likewise, when the *Epitaph for Bion* characteristically puts Bion in the Cyclops' place as a suitor of Galatea (ll. 58–63), Bion's song, unlike that of Polyphemus, is said to have coaxed her out of the sea to his side: here again Polypheman song is strictly about persuasion of the beloved.

In *Id.* 20, the appeal the poem consists of is addressed by a herdsman to an absent, unresponsive beloved (like those in *Id.* 3 and 11). Spurned by a city girl, he boasts of a catalogue of favorable features such as the Cyclops attributes both to himself and to Galatea in *Id.* 11, based on comparisons with rustic things (compare, for example, l. 26, "my lips

⁶³ Timaeus, *FCrHist* 566F69; cf. Livrea (2004).

are softer than cottage cheese”): he is Cyclops and Galatea combined into one. Here the poetry motif, confined to praise of his voice and proficiency on various instruments (ll. 26–29),⁶⁴ is almost detached from *eros*, being just one in a list of his attractions. Lines 26–27, ἐκ στομάτων δέ / ἔρρεέ μοι φωνὰ γλυκερωτέρα ἢ μέλι κηρῶ (“and from those lips my voice flowed sweeter than honey from the comb”), mirror Bion fr. 9.11 χαίροισα διὰ στόματος ῥέει αὐδὰ, “[when I sing of love] my voice flows rejoicing through my mouth”. *Id.* 20 elides causality; proof of the power of *eros* becomes in this poem a futile appeal to the beloved. The next two lines (28–29) are rich with bucolic, particularly late bucolic, significance:

ἄδὺ δέ μοι τὸ μέλισμα, καὶ ἦν σύριγγι μελίσδω,
κῆν αὐλῶ λαλέω, κῆν δώνανι, κῆν πλαγιαύλῳ.

Sweet is my music, whether I play on the panpipe, or give voice with the double pipe, or the reed, or the cross-pipe.⁶⁵

Line 28, like Bion fr. 9.5 ἄδὺ μελίσδῃ or [Bion] 2.1 μέλος ἄδὺ λιγαίνειν, accepts as programmatic the language of Theocr. 1.1–14, but enlists it in the service of *eros*. Once again, in connection with the Polyphemus theme, poetry is about persuasion; but now it is the mere claim to poetic skill that is to persuade (and evidently does not).

Above all late bucolic is concerned with the problem of reciprocity in *eros*, or more generally, the problem of an economy of *eros*. The theme is already frequent in Theocritus, as of course in other Greek poetry. The monologic *Id.* 2 and 3 (both addressed to absent addressees, along with mute characters) are premised on it. As part of the Cyclops tradition its crisis comes at *Id.* 11.75–79, where Polyphemus assuages his passion for Galatea by reflecting that he will surely find a more beautiful girl among the many who, he claims, invite him “to come play at night”. “Milk the one available”, he platitudinizes; “why chase the one who flees?” (l. 75), juxtaposing an earthy analogy relevant to his pastoral status with the classic Greek formulation of unrequited love.⁶⁶ This is evidently the sign of his cure, and is the sublimation that is refused in Bion fr. 3 and 16. It is this refusal to sublimate,

⁶⁴ The Cyclops makes a similar boast to Galatea at *Id.* 11.38: see Trovati (2001) 40, who raises most of the parallels I discuss here.

⁶⁵ The pastoral list of four instruments has a close parallel in Bion fr. 10.7–8 (particularly as including the cross-pipe, πλαγιαύλος).

⁶⁶ Sappho fr. 1.21 Voigt, Theogn. 1299, *Id.* 6.17, Callim. *AP* 12.102.5–6 = *HE* 1039–1040.

associated with the detachment of the *pharmakon* from song (as noted above), that characterizes the problem of erotic reciprocity in surviving late bucolic.

Of the four characters in Moschus fr. 2—Pan, Echo, a Satyr, and Lyda—each loves the next and rejects the one who loves him or her, achieving a kind of unsatisfactory equilibrium (l. 6 *πάσχε δ' ἃ ποίει*, “[each] suffered [the rejection] that he or she dealt”). The fragment ends with an injunction that could be either a positive or negative lesson from this state of affairs: “Love those who love so that when you love you may be loved” (l. 8 *στέργετε τῶς φιλέοντας ἵν' ἦν φιλέητε φιλήσθε*).⁶⁷ This thematic pervades [Theocritus] 23, where Moschan language immediately characterizes the cruel beloved in terms of late bucolic erotics: *μίσει τὸν φιλέοντα*, “he rejected the one who loved him” (ll. 3–5). He is addressed at l. 20 as *ἔρωτος ἀνάξιε*, “unworthy of desire”, by a lover who nevertheless does not cease to direct toward the boy that desire. The didactic last line, *στέργετε δ' οἱ μωσέωντες, ὁ γὰρ θεὸς οἶδε δικάζειν*, “... and love, O ye spurners of love, for the god knows how to pass judgment” adapts the wording of Moschus fr. 2.8, substituting a less ambiguous sense of the proper balance or give-and-take (*δίκη*): love or die. At l. 24 the suicidal lover himself calls death a *pharmakon* for *eros* (“as they say”—he goes on to deny this for his own case). This replacement of song with death as the cure for love answers a whole tradition. In *Id.* 11 unrequited love inspires poetry, which then cures love. *Id.* 23.24 replaces poetry with death in this transaction.

Death remedies unrequited love in a different sense at Bion fr. 12.7, the last line of its fragment: “blessed was (Achilles) in death since he avenged (Patroclus') terrible death”.⁶⁸ The passage begins with a differ-

⁶⁷ For the sentiment cf. *Id.* 6.17, 12.16.

⁶⁸ I follow the mss.: *ὀλβιος ἦν θνήσκειν ὅτι οἱ μόγον αἰνὸν ἄμυνεν*. For the verb in the sense “avenge”, “punish” (here with a dat. of possession or interest) cf. Soph. *Phil.* 602, Asclep. *AP* 5.7.3 = *HE* 848. Most editors prefer to read, with Meineke, *ὅ οἱ οὐ*: “since he did not defend [Patroclus] from a terrible death”. As common as dat. *οἱ* may be with *ἀμύνω* in the sense “ward off from”, it is harder to accept Meineke's historical scenario *ὅτι οἱ* < *ὅ οἱ οὐ*, which involves multiple paleographical assumptions and corruption from a commoner to a more abstruse sense. More plausible emendation to produce the same sense is not forthcoming; in *ὅτι οὐ*, for example, we miss a specification of whose death is meant. The line is a provocative correction, not a rephrasing, of Achilles' death-wish at Homer, *Il.* 18.98–99, alluding to the tradition that Achilles, having avenged Patroclus, chose to die and was transferred to the Islands of the Blessed (Plato, *Symp.* 179e–180a; cf. Aeschin. *Tim.* 145).

ent macarism: ὀλβιοὶ οἱ φιλέοντες ἐπὶ ἴσον ἀντεράωνται, “blessed are those who love when they are desired equally in return”, and illustrates it with three heroic pairs (Theseus and Pirithous, Orestes and Pylades, Achilles and Patroclus), one per distich.⁶⁹ Achilles’ death corrects the “unrequited” love that ensues when Patroclus is killed, either by giving Achilles oblivion (as in *Id.* 23.24) or by restoring Patroclus to Achilles in the afterlife. This pair of alternatives is collapsed in Bion’s *Epitaph for Adonis*, which actually tropes love lost to death as unrequited love. Aphrodite’s plea for a last kiss,⁷⁰ as it comes to its climax in l. 50 with the word φεύγεις (“you flee”), is formally concluded by her surprising complaint in ll. 52–53: ἄ δὲ τάλαινα, / ζῶω καὶ θεὸς ἔμμι καὶ οὐ δύναμαι σε διώκειν, “wretched that I am, I live, and am a goddess, and cannot pursue you”. The verb διώκειν (“pursue”, “chase”) completes the thought introduced by φεύγεις: this pair of verbs is traditional in describing the pursuer and the pursued in love.⁷¹ The literal meaning “you are going away” is at the top of her mind when she speaks, but she cannot quite suppress the connotation of receding love, traditionally complemented by διώκειν. She rejects the possibility of redirecting her desire in the same terms as the Cyclops of *Id.* 11 accepts it.⁷² Her own death is the impossible means of keeping Adonis’ love—that is, him; the figure is immediately followed up by the thought that Persephone possesses Adonis now, as if she were a successful rival (l. 54 λάμβανε, Περσεφόνα, τὸν ἕμὸν πόσιν, “take my consort, Persephone ...”).

In her plea for a last kiss Aphrodite explains (*Adon.epit.* 48–50), “[kiss me] until I drain [ἄμέλξω, literally “milk”] your sweet love [φιλιτρον, otherwise “love potion”] and drink up desire; and I will keep that kiss

⁶⁹ This fragment may come from a pastoral speech, perhaps by the comast of fr. 11 (Reed (1997) 14, 51–52, 176; (2004) 36–38). Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 172 also discusses l. 1 as a radical correction of σκέτλιοι οἱ φιλέοντες (“wretched are those who love”) in Theocr. 13.66. Bion’s line, incidentally, is a remarkable and perhaps unique Greek declaration for reciprocity in male-male erotic relations.

⁷⁰ The analogy of this situation to unrequited love is brought out by a comparison of *Adon.epit.* 13 “to Cypris the kiss is pleasing even though [Adonis] is not alive” with [Theocr.] 27.4 “there is sweet pleasure even in empty kisses”. *Id.* 23.41 “and favor even my corpse with your lips” inverts the Bionean trope: the lover is requesting a posthumous reciprocity of the beloved.

⁷¹ See Theocr. 11.75 and n. 66 above. The figure is anticipated at *Adon.epit.* 43 μείνον ... ὥς σε κίχαιω, “wait, so that I may catch up with you”.

⁷² This rejection of hers is further expressed at ll. 58–60: “you are dead, O thrice-beloved, and desire has flown from me like a dream ... and with you has perished my *kestos*” (the magical embroidered strap containing her powers of seduction): no one else will be loved by her or love her.

as if it were Adonis himself, since you, wretch, flee from me". This is her first answer to the "unrequited" love that Adonis' death produces, before she thinks, vainly, of going after him: his love, entering her with his last breath in the kiss, will be a potion, a drug, that will somehow keep him present. If the suicide of *Id.* 23 replaces Polyphemos' song with death as a cure for love, he reworks Aphrodite's idea of love as a cure for death—and a guarantee against the need for erotic sublimation—when he says that even if he will "put death [as a *pharmakon*] to my lips and drain it [ἀμείλξω again], I will not thus extinguish my desire" (ll. 25–26). His denial that even death will stop him from loving the boy outdoes Bion's Polyphemos in fr. 16, who said only that he would love "until uttermost old age", and his terms recall the speaker of Bion fr. 3, who prays that the Muses "give me song while I forever desire—sweet song, than which no drug is sweeter". Even his reference to "oblivion"—the traditional antithesis of poetry—as the main curative ingredient in death (l. 25 ἐνθα τὸ λάθος) potentially critiques the Cyclops theme: if song cures love by forgetfulness, does it lose its nature as poetry? He rejects oblivion and, implicitly, the traditional value of Polypheman song. But the suicidal lover of *Id.* 23 has always been a poet in some sense. The bulk of his *paraklausithyron* has him imagining—no, scripting, with a long series of imperatives—the beloved's reaction to finding him hanging in the doorway dead. He is explicitly a poet in ll. 47–48, where he dictates the couplet to be inscribed on his tomb. He makes of death his poetic medium.

These brief readings should serve to sketch out some of the different ways late bucolic texts argue with one another about a cluster of Theocritean topics, adopting, ignoring, or revising Theocritus' and one another's ideas, despite their different formal structures and contents. Some of the late bucolic discourse discussed here will follow into Virgil's *Eclogues*, where it will evolve into new ways of thinking about poetry, death, and desire—often (as in late bucolic) premised on reworkings and recombinations of the themes specific to *Id.* 2, 3, and 11.⁷³ But let the last word go to the *Epitaph for Bion*. There, in the Orpheus analogy at the end of the poem (ll. 119–125), song is explicitly the medium of exchange for death, and implicitly for love, when the dead Bion is bidden to sing in the Underworld for his life (like Orpheus for Eurydice's life). We have already learned, however, that the song

⁷³ See esp. *Ecl.* 2, 3, and 8; another example is *Ecl.* 5, indebted to both Theocritus' *Id.* 1 and the *Epitaph for Bion*. Cf. Reed (1997) 191–192.

Bion sings before the gods of the Underworld is one of “Lethe”, that is, oblivion (l. 22 μέλος Ληθαίων). In a poem about poetic inheritance, about both the power and vulnerability of a poetic—specifically the late bucolic—tradition, the efficacy of a “Lethean song” is an aptly paradoxical note with which to end.

THEOCRITUS' CONSTRUCTIVE INTERPRETERS, AND THE CREATION OF A BUCOLIC READER

MARCO FANTUZZI

Every literary genre is in some way a selection and a stylization of a segment of life, and as a result every kind of classical poetry looks more like a synecdochical proposal of a world than an act of imitation.¹ But every type of classical poetry also presented itself as either an imitation of the real or of a figment of the imagination based on the real world: very few ancient literary texts actually attempted to represent abstractly fictional worlds.² Therefore, on the one hand, each genre provided an essentially delimited and more or less evident outlook on a 'portion' of life, but on the other, some 'portion' of life always *had* to be there, recognizable in each poem and framed by the generally coherent constants of behaviour or setting underlying the partial world of every genre—patterns according to which events and actions played out by the characters could be related to the real world, and thus understood by the audience.

Pre-existing traditional genres provided the authors, and their audiences, with ready-made sets of specific 'constants' defining the specific selections of the world created by each genre, for which in all but a few cases (e.g. most likely in the case of the Sicilian mime) the authors, because of the more-than-local diffusion of these genres, could rely on

¹ "Every genre is a model of reality which mediates the empirical world. The text does not work upon the direct presence of 'reality', but upon a selective representation of it. The genre, a paradigm of the things to represent, makes reality recognizable and meaningful by translating it into something it is not. This means that, in order to be perceived, the world must take a form, become a model of meaning; and the literary genre's communicative strategies help the reader to construct a situation ... if poetry is conceived more as a proposal of a world than as mimesis, it is hard to do without genres" (Conte (1994) 112–113).

² An all-embracing ancient taxonomy, in these terms, of the possible ways poetic contents are related to the real world is offered by Σ Hom. *Il.* 14.342–351. The ideas of genres in the archaic and, in part, the classical age were of course different from the Hellenistic one—the former were paradigmatically built on the pre-existing sets of texts, the latter on the pre-existing sets of rules plus texts: cf. Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 21–26—, but the role of pure fictionality remained consistently marginal. On the exceptionally high level of fictionality in Theocritus' bucolic idylls cf. Payne (2006).

a pan-Hellenic competence or at least on their pan-Hellenic resonance. Many of these traditional genres, and par excellence the epos from which Theocritus borrowed the metre for almost all of his poems, also had their stories and characters arranged according to the most coherent structures of the mythical-heroic world³—so coherent, self-defined and ‘expectable’ as to be used often as paradigms for understanding real life. On the contrary, the mimes of Epicharmus and Sophron, which undoubtedly were the main precedent for Theocritus’ urban mimes and an indirect model for his mimetic and non-mimetic pastoral poems, offered in a sense distorted images of the real world of humble people. Furthermore, the Sicilian mime was hardly ever widely diffused beyond the boundaries of the Greek cities of Sicily and Southern Italy, and though the shepherds’ life would always be less foreign to urbanized Greeks of the Hellenistic age than it is to us,⁴ it was probably less well-known to many of these Greeks than was the reality of the urban world, where they lived their everyday life, or the fictional worlds of epic and tragic heroes, with which they were literarily acquainted. Consequently, the focus of a great deal of bucolic poetry on scenes removed from the horizon of expectation of its readers meant that it was especially crucial for Theocritus, as a bucolic author, to insert into his poetry the idea of an implicit reader who was especially ready to catch the hints about how the new genre was ‘functioning’, and to (re)construct it.⁵

In spite of this original handicap, which has to do with what we may call “generic recognizability”—or maybe, as we have said, precisely because of it—, Theocritus’ search for internal coherence and ‘traditionality’ is most obvious in the pastoral poems, perhaps because the urban mimes already had models in the para-literary tradition of the Sicilian mime, as ancient readers well understood.⁶ His bucolic poems strive to give the opposite impression, i.e. of a deep-rooted and con-

³ On differences in coherence, ‘expectability’, and ‘exemplarity’ between the mythological world and the other fictional tales, cf. Pavel (1986) and Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) chap. 4.1.

⁴ Cf. Gutzwiller, this volume, pp. tff.

⁵ Cf. Goldhill (1991) 246.

⁶ Two introductory scholia on *Id.* 2, which are probably the remains of an ancient *hypothesis*, state that “Theocritus derived the character of Thestylis crudely (ἀπειροζάλως, cf. Wendel (1920) 70) from the *Mimes* by Sophron” and that “(the author) derives the plot (ὑπόθεσις) of the spell from the *Mimes* by Sophron” (cf. pp. 269–270 Wendel); the first Σ *Id.* 15 states: “(the author) has formed the poem by analogy with Sophron’s *Women attending the Isthmian games*” (p. 305 Wendel).

ventional generic status, and to represent a coherent, easily recognizable world; while it is true that making the complex simple is a pursuit that contributes to the concentration needed for many kinds of poetry, I believe that this pursuit has especially characterized pastoral poetry from its origins.⁷ Theocritus' bucolic poetry is based on the idealizing presupposition that the 'professional' requirements of a shepherd's life, associated with the activity of looking after the flock, are but a minor distraction from the principal pastimes of playing music and singing—mainly about love, and often at singing contests—and this presupposition grants the shepherds' life a straightforwardly stylized 'simplicity'. Theocritus also selects for his characters a series of specialized behaviours, settings, and *Realien* (including a specific pantheon of rural gods), which contribute to the effect of coherence experienced when reading his pastoral poems.⁸ Theocritus is moreover permanently concerned with 'quoting' (in fact, most probably inventing or at least fictionalizing) a tradition of practically mythologized bucolic singers, song-themes and contests featuring bucolic songs, which had to be progressively acknowledged by his readers as the 'past' underlying his bucolic poems.⁹ Furthermore, a passage like *Id.* 1.23–24 "if you sing as you did once in the match with Lybian Chromis", or the overall Coan geography of *Id.* 7, make it quite clear that Theocritus is also trying, to a certain point, to pan-Hellenize this same tradition, the bulk of which was rooted primarily in Sicily and Southern Italy.

Theocritus' pastoral poems were lucky enough (or rather, as we will see, they 'predestined' themselves) to meet with a posterity of especially cooperative readers. As for his strictly bucolic or broadly pastoral followers, few other literary genres in world history, except for the minor genre of the *Anacreontics*, have exhibited a fuller compliance to a fixed series of 'constants' in setting and characters (in the case of the properly bucolic imitators), or (in the case of the 'pastoral' texts of Moschus and Bion) a more explicit awareness of their dependence on a tradition: Theocritus presupposing or pretending to presuppose Daphnis and his tradition of pastoral songs, and more or less fictional masters of bucolic poetry such as Lycidas; Bion concretely presupposing Theocritus; the *Lament for Bion* presupposing both Theocritus and Bion; Virgil presupposing Theocritus; and all the other pastoral authors presuppos-

⁷ Cf. Empson (1935) 23.

⁸ See Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) chap. 4.1 and 4.2.

⁹ See Acosta-Hughes' and Pretagostini's contributions to this volume.

ing at least Virgil. But the success of Theocritus' fiction of a traditional past, whose effect is that the whole of ancient and modern pastoral poetry looks like an "unbroken tapestry of textual interdependence with ever-renewed declarations of visionary independence or transcendence", is already a well-known fact of literary history.¹⁰ Another well-known fact is that an increased coherence was established in post-Theocritean bucolic poetry by the constant tendency towards a more-than-Theocritean idealization, via stylization, of the bucolic world.¹¹

Not enough attention has been paid to the parallel contribution made by Theocritus' ancient commentaries to the internal coherence of the pastoral world and (hence) to the creation of a bucolic genre. Except for a few cases, it is of course impossible to make chronological distinctions among the *scholia vetera* to Theocritus (or to any other classical author). Therefore I will treat this scholiastic corpus as undifferentiated evidence for the scholarly approaches to Theocritus, from Asclepiades of Myrlea and Theon, at the beginning of the 1st century BC, to Munatius (1st/2nd century AD) and Theaetetus, 2nd century AD, and other interpreters whose ideas survive in the scholia, though their names are not mentioned by the scholiasts or were lost in the course of their transmission.¹² What we perceive from these texts is the almost undifferentiated background 'noise' of an interpretation that tries to systematize even more what in Theocritus had simply tended to be coherent; hardly ever can contradictory voices be heard. My paper will not deal with the problem of understanding what the original pastoral of Theocritus was, as opposed to what it became in the Greek imitators of the Theocritean corpus or in Virgil, but it will investigate, phenomenologically, what specifically the scholarly response to Theocritus' bucolic poetry was, namely how its interpreters, no less than its 'continuators', saw (or thought they saw) and developed a series of literary 'intentions' evident or detectable in Theocritus' poems.

Theocritus had hinted more than once at recreating past, public occasions for the performance of bucolic songs within idylls located in Sicily or Southern Greece, and at least once (*Id.* 1.23–24), as we

¹⁰ The quotation is from Hubbard (1998) 17. On the effectiveness of mimetic desire, through which Theocritus' bucolic poems dramatize the interaction of other fictional bucolic texts with their bucolic audience, and thus provide a 'guide' to ideal reception of bucolic song, see now Payne (2006), chap. 4.

¹¹ See most recently Fantuzzi (1998) and Bernsdorff, this volume, pp. 180–186.

¹² Another was certainly Amarantus (2nd century AD?). A list of the remarks which are expressly ascribed to each of the commentators quoted in the scholia, and which

have said, introduced a non-Sicilian participant into a contest where a bucolic song was being performed. To these hints by Theocritus corresponds, in his commentators, a full theorization of the origins of bucolic poetry, where it is precisely these kinds of occasions that are more systematically 'reconstructed' (or rather fictionalised)¹³ in connection with religious rituals—rituals which to some extent made these origins parallel with tragedy and comedy,¹⁴ and served to grant them not only a past, but also a historical-religious legitimation and the appearance of a broad geographical diffusion in that past. One of them 'internationalised' pastoral radically, since it pointed to song-performances by shepherds which were said to have taken place in Laconia during Xerxes' invasion in order to replace the choruses of virgins in celebration of Artemis Caryatis, and which were from then on continued and exported; in another version, bucolic song is said to have been the continuation of the popular hymns to Artemis sung by the inhabitants of Tyndaris, Sicily, at the feast Orestes established there when he was purified after the theft of the *xoanon* of Artemis from Tauris (this role of Orestes of course provided a concrete panhellenic hint to the origins of bucolics). A third theory had no panhellenic ambitions, but pointed to agonistic song-contests in Syracuse continuing the hymns of thanksgiving that the "rustics" performed in honour of Artemis when she brought a factional strife or a plague in the city to an end.¹⁵ All these theories were at some point summarized and collected in a section entitled Εὐρησις τῶν βουκολικῶν, which is featured in the *Prolegomena* to the scholia in five of the six mss. of Theocritus with *Proleg.*,¹⁶ and was later re-elaborated in the *Prolegomena* to Virgil's *Eclogues* and in the Introduction by Tzetzes to a commentary on Theocritus known as *Anec-*

are therefore datable, can be found in Wendel (1920) 74–84. Munatius is probably to be identified with Munatius of Tralles, one of the teachers of Herodes Atticus; about the identity of Theaetetus no solid hypothesis is possible.

¹³ There are of course few scholars who would be ready today to believe that these occasions really were the 'anthropological' beginnings of the bucolic genre, although 40 years ago Hathorn (1961) 235 could still write: "in the course of these festivals herdsmen and other rustics put on their bucolic performances. Theocritus may well have witnessed some of these".

¹⁴ Cf. Cremonesi (1958).

¹⁵ ὁ δὲ ἀληθὴς λόγος οὗτος, "the true account is" is the personal opinion, and differentiation from the other opinions, which introduces the theory of the Syracusan origins in *Proleg.* Ba.21, p. 2.21 Wendel.

¹⁶ It has been sometimes ascribed to Theon, the first systematic commentator of Theocritus (cf. Reitzenstein (1893) 193–194 and Legrand (1898) 144), but without any solid evidence.

doton Estense (Wendel pp. 1–22). Other chapters of these *Proleg.* aimed to classify the idylls within the ancient system of the literary genres (the one rooted in the Platonic distinction between mimetic and narrative). It is plausible to suppose that at least some of the ancient commentaries, no differently than the later editions of the text with scholia, included as ‘Introductions’ larger versions of these texts, with the effect that ancient readers approaching Theocritus’ poems were provided with the ‘traditionalising’ frame they may not have had in mind: as far as I know, Hellenistic scholarship allotted this kind of reconstruction of a dignified (pre)history to classical tragedy and comedy, but not to other authors and works of the ‘new’ Hellenistic genres, apart from bucolic poetry.

The contribution of the scholia is especially effective in guiding the readers to recognize details of the ‘coherence’ of the bucolic world, details not at all self-evident from a superficial reading of the text and which, in some cases, were likely never even conceived as such by Theocritus himself. We might readily acknowledge the relevance of this task by comparing scholia to Theocritus’ poems of other genres, where such an effort is rarely consistent; furthermore, to my knowledge, there are no similar cases regarding other scholiastic corpora.

I will not presuppose, however, that these interpreters handled Theocritus’ bucolic according to an approach that was, in principle, different from their treatment of other authors. For ancient commentators (and scholiasts) on any classical author, the search for/understanding of internal coherence was always one of the most common methods of interpreting literary texts, as the principle of “explaining Homer through Homer” shows: after all, communication between readers and texts is most often a process set in motion and regulated by a mutually restrictive and magnifying interaction between the explicit and the implicit, between revelation and concealment, such that the implicit is integrated primarily according to the guidelines set by the explicit.¹⁷

In any case, the frequency of the ‘constructive’ remarks by ancient scholiasts on Theocritean bucolic, which attempt to highlight the full systematicity of what is no more than implicitly systematic in the text, is particularly striking. If the interpreters of Theocritus’ bucolic had a special perspective from which they read, it is likely that this was the result of these texts’ ‘generic’ status being objectively special. Ancient scho-

¹⁷ Though of course the explicit is also “in its turn transformed when the implicit has been brought to light”. Cf. Iser (1980) 111.

liasts/commentators on other texts might choose to pursue the 'intentions' of the author, or of his work as a unified text, or of the genre in which the author framed his work, or all (or some) of these parameters at the same time. On the contrary, there was no set of external rules for the bucolic genre, whether pre-existing or serving as an alternative to Theocritus' bucolic texts, whose functioning or malfunctioning might have been highlighted as a foil for these very texts: interpreters of Theocritus would consequently have opted to read his work in light of an idea of "bucolic" that derived mainly from the result of the systematization/radicalization of the text's coherent features and therefore from the 'rules' established by and deducible from the Theocritean texts themselves. The interpreters of Theocritus' bucolic poetry appear to have been eager to find many more applications for these same 'rules' within these same texts: the imaginary world they construct is thus actually more systematic than the one suggested by the text, since as a fact they cooperate with and reinforce the attempt at coherence already found in Theocritus, systematizing these works as a genre. This stance was very much in tune with the practical re-use of Theocritus' bucolic texts by Theocritus' imitators. After all, some of Homer's interpreters used what they believed to be *πρέπον* for Homer as a criterion by which to test the 'authentic' texts against the spurious insertions by the νεώτεροι; on the contrary there is no evidence in the scholia to Theocritus that any of the bucolic idylls whose Theocritean authorship modern scholars have challenged were also considered suspect by the ancients. If ancient scholars raised hardly any doubts about the authenticity of these poems, the reason probably was that they read their 'Theocritean corpus' with the same cooperative-constructive mindset which the imitators had displayed in writing their ps.-Theocritean poems.

As an effect of Theocritus' selection/fictionalization of the shepherds' 'real' world, the shepherds of Theocritus' poetry, as I said above, appear to the readers to devote themselves mainly to their favourite musical pastimes, taking the 'professional' requirements of a shepherd's life, i.e. those connected with looking after the flock, only marginally into consideration: while these professional activities do sometimes take place within the world of Theocritus' shepherds, they do so almost exclusively at the 'thresholds' of the narrative framework, while the central bulk of the narrative always features the staging of a song or of a contest of songs (or a contest of repartees).¹⁸ In *Id.* 7, when Lycidas

¹⁸ In Theocritus the verb βουκολιάσδομαι never means "I am a cowherd (or a

meets Simichidas, the first-person narrator, whom the ancients regularly identified with Theocritus (see below), he comments playfully on Simichidas' walking briskly in the countryside under the hot sun: ἢ μετὰ δαῖτ' ἀκλιτος ἐπείγεται, ἢ τινος ἀστῶν / λανὸν ἔπι θρώσκει; ὥς τοι ποσὶ νισσομένοιο / πᾶσα λίθος πταίοισα ποτ' ἀρβυλίδεσσιν αἶδει, "have you invited yourself to dinner somewhere, or to sample a townsman's wine jar? At the pace you are going the pebbles sing as they spurt from under your boots" (ll. 24–26). Given the specification "at the pace you are going", the last remark may simply be a reference to the haste and speed of Simichidas' stride, characteristics which cause the pebbles on the road to bump up against his shoes and so make a continuous noise (αἶδειν can be used for non-vocal sounds, including e.g. the twang of the bow-string); or else the verb may be a metonymy that makes for a slightly idealized perception of the environment, as in Moschus 5.8 "if it is very windy, the pine ἄδει".¹⁹ But for some ancient interpreters, the poet of the shepherds' musical world was credited with the pathetic fallacy of passing some precisely musical mood on to even the very pebbles that he touched:

Σ 7.26a πᾶσα λίθος: ἴσως διὰ τὴν εὐμουσίαν τοῦ Θεοκρίτου φησὶ καὶ τοὺς λίθους εὐμελῆ ἀποδιδόναι ἦχον προσπταίνοντας τοῖς ποσίν.

"every pebble": it is perhaps as a result of Theocritus'²⁰ taste for music that he says that the pebbles make a melodious sound when they bump into his feet.

Σ 7.26[e] αἶδει: ὥδῃν εὐρυσθμον πέμπει.

"sings": produces a rhythmical song.

The pathetic fallacy was another aspect of Theocritus' idealization of the pastoral world by which he would occasionally attribute to nature an emotional participation and interaction with human affairs. But Theocritus made moderate use of this humanising of nature, and

shepherd)", but always and only "I sing bucolic songs", mainly in the context of an agonistic or friendly exchange of songs (1.23–24, 5.44 and 60, 7.36); so too, the adjective βουκολικός is found in Theocritus only as an attribute of the words αἰοιδά, "song" and Μοῖσα, "Muse" (cf. 1.20, 7.49, and the refrains of Thyrsis's song in *Id.* 1).

¹⁹ A different surplus meaning is possibly provided by Theocritus' expression because of the fact that the stones appear to stumble against (πταίοισα) Simichidas' boots, whereas normally people stumble against stones: this inversion of the more common direction "marks Simichidas' intrusion into an alien world where stones, but not Simichidas, belong" (Hunter (1999) 159).

²⁰ Many of the commentators took for granted Simichidas = Theocritus, cf. below pp. 252–253.

applied it to animals in only two clear cases: in connection with the bees, which feed Comatas while he is closed inside a chest, and with nature as a whole, tame and wild animals alike, which mourns for Daphnis (cf. 1.71–75 and 115–118; 7.78–85). In line with both authors of ps.-Theocritean idylls (especially the author of *Id.* 8²¹) and the so-called “minor bucolic poets” (Bion in the *Epitaph for Adonis* and the author of the *Epitaph for Bion*), who made much more frequent and hyperbolic use of the pathetic fallacy, some ancient readers also recognized it in at least one passage in which Theocritus was not at all explicit about its use: at the end of *Id.* 5, Comatas, the goatherd who wins the singing contest, addresses his kids with the words: ... φρμασσεο, πᾶσα τραγίσκων/νῦν ἀγέλα· κήγῶν γὰρ ἴδ' ὥς μέγα τοῦτο καχαξῶ, κτλ., “now snort, my flock of kids, and see how I loud roar, etc.” (ll. 141–142). The verb φρμασσεσθαι might have meant nothing more than “to snort and leap” in Theocritus, though of course some participation of the kids’ movements in the joyful moment of the shepherd—but just according to the shepherd’s perspective!—was certainly implied by the adverb νῦν, but some ancient readers explicated that this sort of snorting was meant to show that the animals sympathetically participated “with joy” (μεθ’ ἡδονῆς / ἐν ἡδονῇ):

Σ 5.141–143a φρμασσεο: φρμαγμὸν ἀποδίδου μεθ’ ἡδονῆς, τουτέστι βρενθύου καὶ ἐναβρύνου, ὃ πᾶσα ἀγέλη, κτλ.

“snort!”: produce a snorting with joy, namely swagger and be proud, all of you in the herd, etc.

c φρμασσεο: τουτέστι μεθ’ ἡδονῆς σκίρτα, ἐπαίρου, πᾶσα ἀγέλη, κτλ.

“snort!”: that is to say spring with joy, be excited, all of you in the herd, etc.

d (φρμασσεο:) ἐπὶ τῶν ἵππων τὸ φρμασσεσθαι· νῦν δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ σκίρτα, ἴστασο ἐν ἡδονῇ.

⟨“snort!”⟩: φρμασσεσθαι is used of horses; here it is used instead of spring, rouse yourself with joy.

Precisely the same ‘explicitness’ about the sympathetic meaning of φρμασσεσθαι of Theocr. 5.141 which is attested in Theocritus’ commentators to the passage can also be found in Longus 1.32.3, where of Daphnis’ goats it is said that they ἐσκίρτων φρμασσόμεναι καθάπερ ἡδόμεναι, “danced around snorting precisely as if they were joyful” for their

²¹ On whom see Fantuzzi (1998).

owner's safe return: a telling piece of evidence about the similarities in readerly response to Theocritus' bucolic texts by their imitators and commentators.²²

Theocritus' shepherds are anything but philosophers, and the goals of the idealized life they lead in Theocritus' poetry surely do not involve speculative ambitions: ἡσυχία is the only 'theoretical' ideal on which Simichidas focuses in *Id.* 7.126 ἄμμιν δ' ἄσυχία τε μέλοι, "all we should hope for is tranquillity",²³ where Simichidas' invitation to Aratus that he abandon forever his desperate passion and opt for ἄσυχία (l. 122–127) contrasts with Simichidas' peaceful description of the *locus amoenus*.²⁴ Likewise, in order to describe the fullness of his happiness in his union with the beloved and contemplation of the sea, the Daphnis of the ps.-Theocritean *Id.* 8.53–56 simply (traditionally) opposes this happiness to the proverbial wealth of Croesus. At least one commentator, however, interpreted this happiness as a form of αὐτάρχεια 'self-sufficiency'—the key to a happy existence, according to some philosophical schools of the Hellenistic age—and thus turned Daphnis, in the eyes of his readers, into a sort of eudaimonistic philosopher:

Σ 8.53–56b αὐτάρχεις τις ὁ Δάφνις ἥδεται ἐν ταῖς ἀγκάλαις ἔχων τὸν ἐρώμενον ὑπὸ τῇ πέτρᾳ, ἀφορῶν τὴν Σικελικὴν ἅλα καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν.

as a self-sufficient person Daphnis takes pleasure in having his beloved in his arms beneath the rock and looking at the Sicilian sea and his land.

The same connection between rural simplicity of needs and the 'perfect life' implied by our scholion can also be found, with a more explicitly philosophical perspective, in Lucretius' description of the Golden Age: 5.1397–1398 *tum ioca, tum sermo, tum dulces esse cachinni / consuerant; agrestis enim tum musa vigeat*, "that was the age of jests, of talk, of much sweet laughter, the age when the Muse of the countryside held sway".²⁵

A larger number of scholia are careful about highlighting another form of coherence of Theocritus' pastoral world, and stress the strict

²² For other textual connections of Longus 1.32.3 to Theocr. 6.44–45 cf. Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 168–169.

²³ Cf. Edquist (1975).

²⁴ On the connection between the sudden conclusion of the *paraklausithyron* and the celebration of the rustic *locus amoenus* in this poem, cf. Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 137, 146–149.

²⁵ For Lucretius' passage, see the 'Epicurean' interpretation of bucolic by Rosenmeyer (1969) 217–218, and Hardie, this volume, pp. 275ff.

functionality, for Theocritus' narrative, even of elements of the landscape about whose relevance or function Theocritus himself had been not at all explicit. In *Id.* 1.105–106, e.g., at the beginning of the dying Daphnis' taunt addressed to Aphrodite, two details of the landscape to which Daphnis emphatically refers are left completely unexplained by Theocritus: οὐ λέγεται τὰν Κύπριν ὁ βουκόλος; ἔρπε ποτ' Ἰδαν, / ἔρπε ποτ' Ἀγχίσαν· τῆναι δρύες ἡδὲ (Meineke; ὧδε mss.) κύπειρος, / αἱ δὲ καλὸν βομβεῦντι ποτὶ σιμάνεσσι μέλισσαι, “is it not said that the cowherd and Cypris ...? Crawl off to Ida, then; crawl to Anchises! There are oaks and (or “here”) galingale, and the bees hum melodiously about their hives”. “No point ... has been discovered in a contrast between oaks and galingale”²⁶ which appears in the text of the paradosis nor is it, however, easy to understand why precisely these two plants are mentioned, but the scholia integrated a precise explanation for the mention of both plants:

Σ 1.105–106g τῆναι δρύες: δρύες, ὥστε σκέπειν τῷ Ἀγχίσι συνερχομένην αὐτήν· εἰρωνευόμενος δὲ λέγει.

“there the oaks”: oaks, so as to shelter her when (Aphrodite) has sex with Anchises; he speaks ironically.

h ὧδε κύπειρος: ἐνθάδε ταπεινὴ βοτάνη καὶ ἀναπεπταμένος ὁ ἀήρ, καὶ οὐ δυνήσῃ λαθεῖν συνουσιάζουσα. (see also Σi).

“here the galingale”: here are low herbs and the air is open, and you will not be able to make love unseen.

Likewise, at the end of *Id.* 1, in sharp contrast with the sublime opposition of Daphnis to Aphrodite, the frame draws the reader back to the concrete reality of animal sex within the reality of the pastoral environment.²⁷ Immediately before he warns the she-goats not to be too frisky and so arouse the rutting he-goat, the goatherd calls one of the she-goats he wants milked by name: ὧδ' ἴθι, Κισσαίθα· τὸ δ' ἄμελγέ νιν. αἱ δὲ χίμαιραι, / οὐ μὴ σκιρτασῇτε, μὴ ὁ τράγος ὕμιν ἀναστῇ, “come over here, Cissaetha! You milk her! Now, nannies all, stop prancing about, or the billy-goat will be up and after you”, ll. 151–152. Some of the ancient readers (cf. Σ 151a) interpreted this name Cissaetha as meaning “eater of white ivy” (κισσὸς λευκός), but all of the other three known scholia on the passage (cf. Σ 151b, c, d) interpreted the name as express-

²⁶ Hunter (1999) 96–97.

²⁷ On the dynamics of this opposition of raw animal or human sex to more or less idealized pastoral narratives, cf. Stanzel (1995) 82–103.

ing the fact that the goat was in heat—hence her arousing ‘behaviour’. See most clearly Σ 151d:

Κισσαίθα: ἡ πρὸς τὸ γεννᾶν διάπυρος καὶ θερμή, ἀπὸ τοῦ κισσῶ τὸ γεννῶ καὶ τοῦ αἶθω τὸ καίω.

Cissaetha: the (goat) hot and ardent to yean, from κισσῶ “to generate” and αἶθω “to burn”.

Autoschediastic interpretations exist in every corpus of scholia, and more broadly the principle of “interpreting Homer through Homer” was by no means limited to Aristarchus or the Homeric exegesis. Nor was rare for the scholiasts to point to the contextual pertinence of the text they were commenting: already, again, the Homeric scholia took care for instance to stress that Homer did not assign epithets to trees κυκλικῶς, “in a conventional way”, but rather respected the ἰδίωμα, “peculiarity” of each tree: Σ *Il.* 13.390 and *Od.* 7.115. What comes as a surprise in the scholia to Theocritus is their consistent fondness for pointing mainly to the coherent correctness and motivation of Theocritus’ use of the rustic *Realien*—as if all possible narrative items needed to be shown to be properly pastoral or have their presence in Theocritus’ pastoral narrative properly justified. At *Id.* 7.15–16, regarding the smell of the goat-skin that Lycidas wears (νέας ταμίσιοιο ποτόσδον, “smelling of new-made rennet”), Σ 7.16g explains:

εἰώθασι δὲ οἱ ποιμένες ἀπορία χειρομάκτρων τυροποιούμενοι ἀποψᾶσθαι οἷς περιέκινται δέρμασι.

when making cheese the shepherds are accustomed, because of their lack of napkins, to wipe themselves off on the skins they wear.

At 7.66, about the roasting of the κύαμος during the rustic symposium that Lycidas envisions for himself in his song, Σ comments:

οὐ μάτην φησίν. ὁ γὰρ κύαμος διψοποιός, καὶ πόσεως χάριν φησίν.

not without reason (the author) mentions it. Indeed the bean provokes thirst, and he mentions it because of the drinking situation.

At 10.48, οἷτον ἀλοιῶντας φεύγειν τὸ μεσαμβρινὸν ὕπνον, “let those who thresh the corn shun noonday rest”, Σ 10.48–51a and b inform us that people who thresh have to work in the heat of the noon, and not sleep like the harvesters, because when the sunshine is stronger the chaff is made weaker:

ἐπιτήδειος γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ καιρὸς πρὸς τὸ ἀλοᾶν· φεύγοντος γὰρ τοῦ ἡλίου τὴν καλᾶμην τὸ ἄχυρον συμβαίνει λεπτότερον γίνεσθαι. (Σb)

this time of the day is favourable for threshing. When the sunshine parches, as a result the chaff is thinner.

For the ancient interpreters, defending the pastoral correctness of Theocritus also made for a real grasping at straws. For instance at 1.72, where Theocritus includes a lion as a participant in the mourning for Daphnis, Σb attempts an extreme defence of the author's zoological competence:

τινὲς αἰτιῶνται τὸν Θεόκριτον καὶ φασιν ἐν Σικελίᾳ λέοντα μὴ εἶναι. ἀλλὰ προστιθεμένη ἢ ἂν συλλαβὴ λύει τὴν αἰτίαν, ἵνα ἢ τήνον ἂν ἐκλαυσεν, εἰ ἐν Σικελίᾳ λέων ἦν.

some accuse Theocritus, and say that there are no lions in Sicily. But it is enough to add a syllable and the charge is cancelled, so that we have: "the lion would have wept for him, if the lion had been in Sicily".

Or, at 1.86–91, when Priapus finds fault with Daphnis' wish to "dance with the maidens" and compares his behaviour, derogatorily, with that of the goatherds (βούτας μὲν ἐλέγευ, νῦν δ' αἰπόλῳ ἀνδρὶ ἔοικας, "cowherd were you called? More like a goatherd now", l. 86), the commentators of l. 86 felt compelled to find an explanation in terms of a pastoral logic they were attempting to reconstruct:

βούτας μὲν ἐλέγευ: βουκόλος ὢν, φησὶν, οὐ κατὰ βουκόλους ἐρᾷς. οἱ μὲν γὰρ βουκόλοι πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἀφροδισίων μῖξιν ἐγκρατεῖς, τοῦναντίον δὲ λαγνότατοι οἱ αἰπόλοι· καὶ ἡ αἰτία, ὅτι κατωφερέστεραι οὔσαι αἱ αἴγες δελεάζουσι τοὺς αἰπόλους. (Σα)

"you were called a cowherd": you are a cowherd, but you do not love the way the cowherds do. Indeed the cowherds are self-controlled about sexual intercourse, on the contrary the goatherds are lecherous; the reason is that the goats, which are lewd, entice the goatherds.

βούτας μὲν ἐλέγευ: παροιμία τοῦτο ἐπὶ τῶν ἡσύχων μὲν πρῶτον καὶ ἡμέρων, ἔπειτα δὲ ἀγρίων. οἱ γὰρ βόες ἡμεροὶ εἰσιν· ἀπὸ γοῦν τῶν βοσκομένων καὶ οἱ βόσκοντες αὐτοὺς τοιοῦτοι λέγονται. αἱ δὲ αἴγες ἄγριαι, παρόσον καὶ εἰς τὰ ὑψηλὰ τῶν ὄρων καὶ εἰς κρημνώδεις τόπους νέμονται· ἀπὸ τούτων δὲ καὶ οἱ αἰπόλοι τοιοῦτοι λέγονται. (Σβ)

"you were called a cowherd": it is a proverb about people who are first quiet and docile, but then become fierce. Indeed the oxen are docile: from the animals they tend, also their shepherds have the reputation of being docile. On the contrary the goats are wild, since they graze in the upper parts of the mountains and in the hilly places; from them the goatherds are also called wild.

Both interpretations not only intend to show the pastoral appropriateness of the goatherd/cowherd hierarchy, but are clearly shaped to sat-

isfy the requirements of the specific narrative function that the hierarchy goatherd/cowherd has in our passage (to stigmatize Daphnis being δύσερως).²⁸

Even etymology (in most cases of course autoschediastic paretymology) is often adopted to explain (and in at least some cases, to allege) the most thorough pastoral relevance of as many details as possible. Etymology, no less than autoschediasm, was a common ‘interpretative’ device of ancient commentators and hence of later scholiasts on every kind of text. But in other texts, the focuses and emphases according to which etymology ‘motivates’ names in respect to an entity’s features or functions are more variable. What is peculiar to the commentators on Theocritus’ bucolic idylls is the high degree of specialization of their etymological exegeses with a view to explaining the role of objects, animals, humans, and gods as a function of the bucolic environment—it is as if the commentators were setting out to prove that the objects/animals/humans/gods who enter the bucolic narrative have a bucolic motivation which precedes that narrative, and motivates their presence within it.

At *Id.* 5.34, just after inviting Comatas to sit and sing in the shadow of the trees (ἄδιον ἄσῃ / τεῖδ’ ὑπὸ τὰν κότινον καὶ τᾶλσεα ταῦτα καθίξας, “you will sing the sweeter if you sit over here, under the wild olive and those taller trees”, ll. 31–32), Lacon remembers that there he will enjoy nice grass and the sound of the crickets (ἀκρίδες ὧδε λαλεῦντι, “and here the crickets are chirruping”). Theocritus does not include any “therefore” connecting the idea of sitting in the shadow of the trees and the pleasurable music of the crickets there, but rather a late²⁹ commentator imposed a precise connection:

Σ 5.34c καὶ ἀκρίδες: ἀκρίδες λέγονται τὰ πωλία τὰ καθήμενα εἰς τὰ ἄκρα τῶν δένδρων καταχρηστικῶς· κυρίως γὰρ αὐτὰ τὰ ἄκρα τῶν δένδρων,

“and the crickets”: ἀκρίδες refers to the young animals that settle in the extremities of the trees, by a misuse of language. Indeed they properly are the extremities of the trees,

²⁸ The hierarchy is reposed by Aelius Donatus, *Vita Verg.* 49 Diehl. More simply, it may apply “to the real countryside, where the type of stock grazed reflects the quality of the land”: cf. Coleman (1977) 24.

²⁹ The language of the scholium certainly belongs to a late age (I owe the remark to the kindness of Jagoda Luzzatto): πωλίον, usually “young horse” or the young of large animals such as elephants, is not attested for “chick” (the only plausible meaning in our text) earlier than Σ Opp. *Hal.* 3.243, 5.579 or *Geopon.* 14.8.3. Also καθίσθαι governing εἰς + accusative sounds odd, and I could find no instance earlier than Alciphron 2.24.1.

though ἀκρίδες is found nowhere else to mean any kind of “young animals etc.”, and the etymology is most probably false, since ἀκρις (not ἀκρίς, anyway) is attested only as a “hill-top”.

A couple of cases concern the pastoral motivation (in Cratylean terms) of some allegedly pastoral objects. At 5.58, for instance, the Σ *ad loc.* interprets γαυλός as a recipient for the milk—whereas in most of the other literary occurrences known to us the term clearly denotes a vessel for water or wine³⁰—, and suggests its derivation from γάλα:³¹

ἀγγεῖα χυτροειδῇ γαλακτοδόχα, ἐν οἷς πήσσουσι τὸ γάλα· παρὸ καὶ εἴρηται πλεονασμῷ τοῦ υ, ἅτινα καὶ ἀμολγέας καλοῦσι (~ Σ 5.104),

vessels with the form of pots, holding milk, hence their name, with the addition of an upsilon. They are the ones which are also called ἀμολγεῖς,

or in the Σ 7.16e (νέας ταμίσιοιο) the τάμισος is paronymologized according to its function:

τάμισος ... παρὰ τὸ θαμίζειν, ὃ ἐστὶ πυκνοῦν.

“τάμισος” ... from θαμίζειν, that is “to condense”.

But the field in which the scholiast's etymological search is especially engaging and effective is personal onomastics. As I remarked earlier, Theocritus seems to offer less etymological wordplay than other poets of the age, and Virgil's *Eclogues* also contain comparatively fewer examples of etymological wordplay than his other works;³² but at the same time, most of the names of pastoral animals, and of some pastoral characters, seem to have been chosen according to their significance in connection with pastoral activities—as was noted by Servius, Praef. to the *Ecl.* comm. (III.4.4–5 Thilo) *etiam hoc sciendum, et personas huius operis ex maiore parte nomina de rebus rusticis habere conficta*.³³ Indeed it may not be a

³⁰ Cf. *DGE* s.v.

³¹ This interpretation and etymology is also known from later sources: cf. *Etym. Magn.* 222.25–27 Gaisford.

³² Cf. O'Hara (1996) 38 and 238. According to O'Hara, in the case of Virgil this phenomenon can be explained by the fact that aetiology and origins are not as major a concern in the *Eclogues* as in the *Georgics* and *Aeneid*—an explanation that does not seem to be completely satisfactory in the case of Virgil, but of course is out of the question in that of Theocritus.

³³ Of course onomastic motivation also occurs in other literary genres, especially in comedy, as Servius himself admits (*sicut etiam in comoediis*: III.4.8 Thilo), but the motivation of the comic names hardly ever has the effect (which it does have in bucolic poetry) of emphasizing the coherence of the genre, since in comedy it refers to several situations and environments of everyday life, whereas bucolic motivation almost invariably focuses on the bucolic world.

sheer chance that one of the few wordplays found in a bucolic poem by Theocritus, and most probably the most emphatic of them all, comes from the unwitting mouth of the awkward Cyclops, who begins his song by addressing Galateia ‘Miss Milky’ in making a bathetic comparison between her white colour and cheese (ll. 19–20 “O white Galatea ... whiter than curds to look on, etc.”), a comparison that appears *not* to exploit the etymological connection between Galatea’s name and whiteness as a pre-existing matter of fact and so to actually motivate the name.³⁴ Theocritus may have assumed the other bucolic characters were expert enough in their world that they did not need to hint often at the motivations of its names. His commentators, on the contrary, do in many cases explicate a motivation that might otherwise have been too obscure for a general readership who did not share the competence of the author and his characters; they thus reveal the names’ ‘pertinence’ to the bucolic world, a pertinence that otherwise might pass unnoticed.

We have already encountered above the goat Cissaetha, who is made functional to her context by means of her name. Ὀλπις ὁ γριπεύς, “the fisherman” mentioned in 3.25, according to Σ 3.25–26e, must necessarily be ὁ τοὺς λεπιδωτοὺς ἰχθύας ἀγρεύων ἢ ὁ τοὺς ἔλλοπας ἀγρεύων, “the one who catches fish that are λεπιδωτοί ‘scaly’, or the one who catches fish that are ἔλλοπες ‘dumb’”. The name of the cow apostrophised by Battus in *Id.* 4.46, Κυμαίθα, is explained by Σ *ad loc.* as ὄνομα βοὸς ἢ αἰγὸς παρὰ τὴν κόμυνθα ἢ ἡ τὰς κόμας αἰθὰς ἔχουσα, τούτέστι ξανθὰς, “the name of a cow or of a goat, from κόμυς ‘bundle’; or because her hair is αἰθὸς ‘red-brown’, that is auburn” and the name Λάμπουρος of the dog of *Id.* 8 provoked no fewer than three interpretations. The two suggestions of Σ 8.65b, e.g., were:

ὦ Λάμπουρε κύον: ὄνομα κυνὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ λαμπρὰν ἔχειν τὴν οὐρὰν ἡγουν πυρρὰν ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ λίαν φυλάσσειν.

“Lampouros, my dog”: name of a dog, from the fact that he has a shiny tail, that is to say πυρρὸς ‘flame-coloured’, or from the fact that he keeps guard exceedingly.

According to the Σb, the ram quoted at 5.102–103, Κώναρος, is called by this name διὰ τὸ τὰ κέρατα ἔχειν τραχέα καὶ περιφερῇ ὡς κώνους ἦτοι στροβίλους, “because he has jagged and rounded horns, like pinecones”, while the other ram mentioned in l. 102, Φάλαρος, would have

³⁴ Cf. Hunter (1999) 230.

had this name, according to Σ 5.102–103i–k, because he is either λευκός, “white” (coll. Hom. *Il.* 13.799, where φαληριόων is used for the sea-waves) or φολιδωτός, “clad in scales”.

As for the names of the pastoral characters, no evidence exists for the pre-existence of Tityrus or Bucaeus, and a precise bucolic motivation can be detected (and was promptly detected by the ancients) for both.³⁵ For the latter, see below, p. 255. For the former, some interpreters established an equivalence between Τίτυρος, the name of a goatherd in *Id.* 7 and of a shepherd in *Id.* 3.2–5, and Silenus or Satyrus, the rustic gods who quite frequently accompany Pan in iconography and poetry, or the he-goat as the leader of the flock,³⁶ or the reed.³⁷

Σ 3.2a Τίτυρος ὄνομα κύριον. τινὲς δὲ φασιν, ὅτι τοὺς Σεληνοὺς οὐ(τω)ς οἱ Σικελιώται ἄλλοι δὲ τοὺς τράγους, ἕτεροι δὲ τοὺς Σατύρους ... τινὲς δὲ καὶ κάλαμον (~ Σ 7.72c).

“Tityrus” is a proper name. Some say that the Sicilians call the Silenuses in this way, others believe they call so the he-goats, others the Satyrs ... some say that “Tityrus” is a reed.

Most fancifully, since Pan is a ubiquitous presence in Theocritus' bucolic idylls, at least one ancient scholar quoted by Σ 7.45–46c (a certain Dionysius) suggested that Ὠρομέδων of 7.46, whose height exemplifies those buildings of huge proportions that Lycidas dislikes, was not a mountain of Cos (the usual interpretation of the ancients, no less than of the moderns, emphasized as the correct one at least by one commentator: Σ 7.45–46c τὸ δὲ ἀληθές), but the epithet of Pan, παρὰ τὸ μέδειν τῶν ὄρων, “because he takes care of the mountains” (Σ 7.45–46c ~ d and e), “since he is a rustic god” (ἀγροικικὸς γὰρ θεός, Σ 7.45–46d).³⁸

As regards Pan's epithet ἄκτιος of *Id.* 5.14, which might mean “of the shore”, possibly connected with the temple of Pan on the shore of the river Cratis (Σ 5.14–16b and c; see also d), at least one ancient

³⁵ Cf. Wendel (1901) 34.

³⁶ Indeed we cannot rule out the possibility that with this name the protagonist apostrophizes not a friend of his, who tends his flock while he sings, but the he-goat who leads and watches the rest of the flock.

³⁷ Virgil may have programmatically reflected this last etymology in the first two lines of *Ecl.* 1: *Tityre, tu ... meditaris avena* (cf. Hunter (1999) 111). As according to Athenaeus 182d Artemidoros would have stated that “the καλάμνος *aulos* is called τυτύρινος among the Dorians in Italy”, it is tempting to suppose that “Virgil is exploiting Artemidoros' definition to characterise his work as “Italian Doric” and thus to signal his Theocritean programme” (so Cairns (2000)).

³⁸ According to a third exegesis, the term was an epithet of the sun ὡς βασιλεύοντα τῶν τεσσάρων ὥρων, “as ruling over the four seasons” (Σ 7.45–46e).

commentator forced the word ἄκτιος to convey a more rural meaning, which it probably never had:

ἄκτιον: τὸν κυνηγόν· ἐπακτῆρες γὰρ οἱ κυνηγοί, ὥς φησιν Ὀππιανός (*Hal.* 1.20), κτλ. (Σ 5.14–16a).

“ἄκτιον”: the hunter. Indeed the hunters are ἐπακτῆρες, as Oppian says, etc.

In tune with Theocritus’ frequent blending of the bucolic singers with their fictional doublets who ‘enact’ the ideal performance and reception of the bucolic song (Thyrsis with Daphnis, Lycidas with Comatas, Daphnis and Damoetas with Polyphemus and his advisor),³⁹ the onomastics of Theocritus’ bucolic poetry reveal a couple of peculiar features. One of these is the use of a limited number of characters, or rather of multi-character names: Daphnis, the Cyclops, Tityrus, and Comatas—i.e. all the characters presented by Theocritus as inherited from pre-existing traditions about bucolic song and singers (Daphnis, Comatas, Tityrus), or from the literary tradition (the Cyclops, Philoxenus’ singer of love) appear in at least two idylls each, though from idyll to idyll they display very different characteristics: they are either clearly presented as a class of prototypical heroes of the small bucolic mythology, and move in the past, or at least in an idealized/unrealistic atmosphere (such as the Tityrus who sings of Daphnis and Comatas in 7.72–82 within Lycidas’ projection of his future dreamy symposium, the Daphnis sung of by Tityrus in *Id.* 7 and by the goatherd in *Id.* 1, the Cyclops of *Id.* 11, and Tityrus’ Comatas in *Id.* 7.78–85), or on the contrary share the features of all other ‘living’ characters probably introduced by Theocritus, with no ‘heroic’ (or mock-heroic, in the case of the Cyclops) aura, performing the semi-realistic jobs and enjoying the same recreations fictionalized by Theocritus as typically bucolic: Daphnis and the Cyclops(-Damoetas) of *Id.* 6, Tityrus who tends the flock of the protagonist in *Id.* 3.3–5, or the rather obscene Comatas of *Id.* 5.⁴⁰ Another aspect of the onomastics of Theocritean bucolic poetry was the masking of an essentially authorial “ego” under a different name in Theocr. 7, a first-person narration by a character called Simichidas. This character does not coincide completely with the author (Theocritus), and at times, especially in the early stages of their encounter,

³⁹ For this aspect of Theocritus’ bucolic poetry, see now Payne (2006) chap. 3 and 4.

⁴⁰ On this distinction between (semi-)mythical characters, and the characters with the same name, who are presented as living and contemporary, cf. Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 149–151 and Kossaiifi (2002) 354–357.

the other protagonist of the poem, Lycidas, seems to regard Simichidas with a certain superior detachment and humour.⁴¹ It is, however, clear that Simichidas represents, in many respects, an 'ideal image' of the author himself—initially a "town poet", who appears to be made a bucolic poet by the expert, perhaps semi-divine, poet Lycidas, and undoubtedly demonstrates that he has thoroughly mastered the magic of the countryside when he enthusiastically describes the *locus amoenus* at the end of the poem.⁴²

Both the relative fixedness of Theocritus' bucolic names, with their parallel trend of being 're-used' for different situations (if not characters), and the tendency to use pseudonyms for the author (or other historical characters), were to become a permanent aspect of bucolic poetry.⁴³ Two of the presumably oldest ps.-Theocritean poems, *Id.* 8 and 9, e.g., immediately repeated the practice of the Theocritean Cyclopes, Daphnises, and Menalcases, and featured the couple of characters Daphnis and Menalcas. Most of the names found in the *Eclogues* had already occurred in Theocritus, and the ones not found in Theocritus had been present in other Greek bucolic traditions (Menalcas), or were Greek anyway, and therefore in a way 'pretended' to have a traditional past (e.g. Meliboeus). Furthermore Virgil presented—or might be interpreted as presenting—aspects of his personal life *Tityri sub persona*⁴⁴ in *Ecl.* 1 and under the name of Menalcas in *Ecl.* 9,⁴⁵ and it is certain that he was quoting two of his own poems as Menalcas' in *Ecl.* 5.86–87. In line with Virgil and the later bucolic poets, the ancient commentators of Theocritus also began a real hunt to identify unnamed characters with the names of other characters in other poems, or to discover pseudonymous authorial presences, since they did apparently perceive

⁴¹ This restrictive perspective on Simichidas is most probably to be included in the balance between high claims and modesty which characterizes him: cf. Segal (1974b) 133–136.

⁴² See above, p. 244; see also the analogous conclusions of Nickau (2002a).

⁴³ On the modern attempt at discovering a bucolic masquerade already in Theocritus (by Reitzenstein (1893) 229–234), and later allegorical readings of Theocritus' characters, cf. Hubbard (1998) 31–37. As Korenjak (2003) 71 correctly remarks: "Servius demonstriert ... eindrucksvoll, dass die biographische *Eclogon*-Allegorese der Kaiserzeit zwar nicht in *puncto* Methodik und Systematik, dafür aber quantitativ weit über die Ansätze hinausgeht, die in den Theokritscholien zu finden sind".

⁴⁴ Servius *ad Virg. Ecl.* 1.1 (III.4.21–22 Thilo).

⁴⁵ Cf. Servius *ad Virg. Ecl.* 9.1 ... *Menalcae, quem nunc pro Vergilio debemus accipere* (III.109.2–3 Thilo). Somewhat less plausibly, Virgil was identified with Corydon (and Caesar with Alexis) in *Ecl.* 2 (cf. Servius *ad Ecl.* 2.1, III.18.1–16 Thilo).

Theocritus' bucolic world as a coherent system that called upon the reader to fill in information gaps on the basis of his personal knowledge of that system.⁴⁶

As for the latter point (the 'need for a name'), the ancients had none of the modern prudence about fully identifying Simichidas, the narrator of *Id.* 7, with Theocritus: the introductory Σ /*Hypothesis* to the poem simply speaks of the narrator straightforwardly *calling him* Theocritus (p. 76.16 Wendel), and Σ 7.21a and b propose a couple of explanations for the pseudonym; only Σ a also remind readers that according to another theory this Simichidas would have been one of Theocritus' friends. See (Σ 7.21a):

Σμιχίδα: οἱ μὲν αὐτὸν φασὶ Θεόκριτον, καθὼ Σμίκχου ἦν υἱὸς ἢ καθὼ σμῖος ἦν. οἱ δὲ ἕτερόν τινα τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ καὶ οὐ Θεόκριτον, κτλ.

"Simichidas": some say he is Theocritus himself, because he was the son of Simichos or because he was snub-nosed. According to others he is one of his circle, and not Theocritus, etc.

Apart from this obvious and legitimate identification, which after all Theocritus' text certainly encouraged, and in the wake of this most probable authorial pseudonym, commentators boldly discovered other authorial presences which would be hardly conceivable to modern scholars.

For instance, since *Id.* 3 is narrated in the third person, and since the narrator, who does not name himself, is called σμῖος at l. 8, and the addressee of the serenade is Amaryllis (the beloved of Battus in *Id.* 4), some commentators advanced the hypothesis that the narrator was Battus, while Munatius suggested that he was Simichidas-Theocritus.⁴⁷ Besides the introductory Σ to the poem, see Σ 3.1a and 3.8–9a respectively:

τὸ πρόσωπον οὐκ ἔστι φανερόν τὸ λέγον. καὶ οἱ μὲν φασιν αὐτὸν τὸν Θεόκριτον εἶναι διὰ τὸ σμῖον καταφαίνεσθαι (l. 8): οἱ δὲ Βάττον αἰπόλον τινά, ὃν ἐν τῷ Αἰγῶνι εἰσάγει τῆς Ἀμαρυλλίδος ἐρῶντα (*Id.* 4.38–39): ἀπρεπὲς γὰρ Θεόκριτον τῆς ἀγρῶας ἐρᾶν, ὥστε καὶ ἐν ἀγρῷ διάγειν (see also Σ 4.38–39d).

it is not clear who the character who speaks is. Some believe it is Theocritus himself, since he presents himself as snub-nosed (l. 8). For others

⁴⁶ As Gutzwiller (1991) 181 remarked about Theaetetus; but this remark has a much broader application. Gutzwiller (1980) 180 suggests that Munatius may have been the originator of this hunt.

⁴⁷ Cf. Wendel (1920) 75.

he is Battus, a goatherd whom the poet introduces in the idyll *Aegon* (= *Id.* 4) as in love with Amaryllis (*Id.* 4.38–40). Indeed it is unseemly that Theocritus is in love with a rustic girl, and that he lives in the countryside.

ἢ ῥά γέ τοι σιμός: τινὲς διὰ τὸ σιμός τὸν Θεόκριτόν φασι (κωμάζειν), κτλ.
(see also Σb).

“really then (I seem) snub-nosed ...?”: some say that it is Theocritus who serenades, because of the σιμός ‘snub-nosed’.

Likewise, since the goatherd who invites Daphnis to sing in *Id.* 1 is unnamed, the ancients (possibly Munatius⁴⁸) suggested that he must be identified with either the goatherd Menalcas⁴⁹ or the goatherd Comatas (introductory Σd):⁵⁰

ἐν τούτῳ τῷ εἰδυλλίῳ διαλέγονται πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς Θύρσις ποιμὴν καὶ αἰπόλος, ἥτοι Μενάλκας ἢ Κομάτας· ἀγνοεῖται γὰρ τοῦ αἰπόλου τὸ ὄνομα.

in this idyll the characters who speak to each other are the shepherd Thyrsis and a goatherd, namely Menalcas or Comatas; the name of the goatherd is unknown.

As for the trend to identify the unnamed characters with other characters attested in the other poems of Theocritus, some interpreters correctly understood that Βουκαῖε of *Id.* 10.1 was the proper name Βουκαῖος, while others did not (Σ 10.1–3b).⁵¹ For the interpreters, according to whom βουκαῖος was not a proper name but originally an adjective (the view which apparently prevailed in the scholiastic tradition), the presence of a Milon was enough for the inference to be made that his interlocutor had to be Battus, since in *Id.* 4 the cowherd Battus had been presented in connection with a Milon: thus the introductory Σ/*Hypothesis* to *Id.* 10 gives, unchallenged, the information:

⁴⁸ Cf. Gutzwiller (1991) 181.

⁴⁹ Who in the most probably ps.-Theocritean *Id.* 8, the only poem of the Theocritean corpus where he appears, is sometimes represented as a shepherd (ll. 9, 14, 35, 67), whereas in his songs he represents himself as a goatherd (ll. 45, 49, 63).

⁵⁰ Who is called a goatherd in *Id.* 7.78.

⁵¹ According to the latter βουκαῖον οἱ μὲν τὸν θεριστὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ βου ἐπιτακτοῦ καὶ τοῦ καίνω τὸ κόπτω καὶ θερίζω, ὁ μεγάλως καίνων· ἢ σὺν βοῇ καὶ ᾠδῇ. τινὲς δὲ τὸν βουκόλον. βλέπον δὲ τὸν ἀροτῆρα ἀκούειν, τὸν σὺν τοῖς βουοῖ καίνοντα τὴν γῆν, “βουκαῖον is for some the reaper, from βου intensive and καίνω which means to cut and to mow, the one who καίνει much; or from βοή ‘shout’ and ᾠδή ‘song’. Some believe that it means βουκόλος ‘cowherd’. Better to understand the ἀροτῆρ ‘plougher’, the one who καίνει ‘kills’ the earth with the oxen”.

Μίλων δ' ἔστι καὶ Βάττος ἐν τῷ θερίζειν προσδιαλεγόμενοι ἀλλήλοις.

Milon and Battus talk to each other while harvesting.

Love is one of the themes that Theocritus' shepherds discuss most often, and the opposition between unhappy, tormented love (and love poetry) on the one hand, and bucolic life (and poetry) on the other, can clearly be read in his poetry. Thus the *ekphrasis* on the cup in *Id.* 1 contrasts the restless pain of a woman's contending pair of lovers with the peacefulness of rustic life, and in *Id.* 7 the invitation of Simichidas to Aratus to abandon forever his desperate passion is opposed to the bucolic serenity which results from giving love up. Moreover, Bucaeus' awkward love-song in *Id.* 10 (ll. 24–37) is contrasted with Milon's work-song (ll. 42–55) with an implied authorial preference for the latter.⁵² Indeed Theocritus' bucolic poems adopt a manner of structuring the hexameter *cola* that fully matches the new 'Callimachean' laws of refinement of the harmonic sound of the verse, but Bucaeus' song displays the most unrefined hexameters found in the bucolic poems of Theocritus, together with the other parodic love-song of the Cyclops in *Id.* 11.⁵³ This feature is probably even stressed in an explicit way by Milon himself in his remark at l. 39 ἢ καλὰς ἄμμε ποῶν ἐλελάθει Βοῦκος αἰοιδάς: / ὥς εὖ τὰν ιδέαν τὰς ἁρμονίας ἐμέτρησεν, "say, boys, Bucaeus never let on that he could turn such verses! How well he fit the thing to the metre!". This ironic approval singles out the appropriateness of Bucaeus' awkward (= inharmonious) melody to his awkward (clumsy) contents.⁵⁴ The sadness caused by frustration, which was a topic in every traditional kind of love poetry, as well as in contemporary love epigram, is exacerbated within bucolic poetry by the marked contrast with the concrete possibility of *hasychia*, which is granted by the environment fictionalized by the new genre.

But this idea of love is not the only one featured in bucolic poetry. On the one hand, narratives of love in Theocritus' pastoral poems illustrate the traditional possibilities of excess and unfulfilment: the drama of the mysterious erotic misbehaviour of Daphnis in *Id.* 1, the parodic serenades of the goatherd of *Id.* 3, of the Cyclops of *Id.* 11, and of the reaper Bucaeus in *Id.* 10,⁵⁵ the interrupted/denied serenade sung

⁵² On the opposition love/work in *Id.* 10, see in general Lentini (1998).

⁵³ Cf. Fantuzzi (1995).

⁵⁴ As remarked by the ancient scholia: cf. Σ 38–40c ὥς εὖ τὰν ιδέαν: ταῦτα λέγων ὑβρίζει αὐτόν and d ὥς εὖ τὰν ιδέαν τὰς ἁρμονίας ἐμέτρησεν: καὶ τοῦτο κατ' εἰρωνείαν.

⁵⁵ What Isenberg and Konstan (1984) 311 say about *Id.* 3 can be said of Theocritus'

by Simichidas in *Id.* 7, the desperation of Battus over the death of the beloved Amaryllis in *Id.* 4.38–43, interrupted by Corydon's appeal to an obliviousness which has to come from oneness with the rhythmic alternation of bad and good (weather or situations) within the world of nature. On the other hand, the raw, easy-going and easily fulfilled sexuality of animals and/or of shepherds is shown in the endings of the frames of *Id.* 1 and 4 and in the whole of *Id.* 5. Why Theocritus conceived this 'double-barrelled' love cannot, of course, be ascertained, but the latter emphasis on animal sexuality surely might be believed to match more closely the rustic environment of the countryside, even to be a 'structural' part of it, whereas the desperate wooing songs of the shepherds seem to be felt (and certainly are almost always presented) by Theocritus as awkward 'incidents' within pastoral life—when they are not just contrasted with it as an incompatible opposite. As has been rightly remarked, "the lover's condition is one of discord and separation within a separate sphere, representing a rupture in the fabric of the bucolic world. It is this loneliness that elicits the song, which has always something of the plaintive strains of a lament for a lost wholeness, an irrecoverable moment of oneness with others in a garden's universe".⁵⁶

Sexual innuendo is often based just on unspoken nuances, and may always be recognized by some but not by others. It is striking, however, that in line with these functions of the love stories within the bucolic poems, or rather in strong sympathy with the naturalistic = rustic idea of raw sex, we never see the scholiasts on Theocritus engaged in the activity of idealizing the shepherds' love or sex, but on the contrary several remarks can be found that make explicit the rudest sexual meanings or double-entendres in passages where obscenity is not at all evident—more than once the scholia speak of τὸ ἔσω νοούμενον "inner meaning" (see below) which indeed Theocritus had in most cases left covert. An obviously fertile field for this kind of consideration is *Id.* 5. At ll. 118–119 ὅχα μάν ποκα τεῖδέ τυ δήσας / Εὐμάρας ἐκάθηρε, καλῶς μάλα τοῦτό γ' ἴσαμι, "I'll tell you what I remember: how Eumaras tied you there and gave you a dusting down". There is no reason to think,

serenades in general: "it is in principle a solipsistic conception, for the object of desire never emerges from behind its screen, so that the lover must find in himself, if anywhere, the resources to end the ceaseless compulsion. The object must be disclosed as a mere projection, a thing whose content is to serve as the sign of lost wholeness".

⁵⁶ Cf. Konstan (1994) 169.

or at least it is not necessary to assume, that Comatas' phrase, as a riposte, perseveres with the sexual perspective that was certainly present in his previous statement about his past intercourse with Lacon. But at least Σb 5.119 assumes an obscene meaning of the verb καθαίρειν (= πυγίζειν) which is not attested elsewhere,⁵⁷ though it also displays the non-obscene interpretation (καθαίρειν = "strike", "flagellate") given by the two other scholia (a and c):

Εὐμάρας ἐκάθηρε: ... τοῦτο δὲ γινώσκω, ὅτι ὁ δεσπότης σου δῆσας σε ἐπύγριζεν, ὅπερ δηλοῖ τὸ ἐκάθηρε. ἢ ἐκάθηρεν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔτυπτε καὶ ἐξέδερε, κτλ.

"Eumaras ἐκάθηρε": ... this I know, that your owner used to bind and fuck you: this is the meaning of ἐκάθηρε. Or ἐκάθηρεν is used instead of "beat" and "stripped off the skin", etc.

In ll. 112–113 μισέω τὰς δασυκέρκους ἀλώπεκας, αἱ τὰ Μίκωνος / αἰεὶ φοιτῶσαι τὰ ποθέσπερα ῥαγίζονται, "how I hate the shagtailed foxes, who come creeping up and into Micon's place at evening, pilfering the grapes." The phrase may just hint at the proverbial harmfulness of foxes for crops and vineyards,⁵⁸ and have no obscene double-entendre. But a plurality of ancient scholars, according to Σb, pointed to exactly such a meaning:

μισέω τὰς δασυκέρκους: τινὲς οὕτω κατὰ τὸ ἔσω νοούμενον λέγουσι· μισῶ τοὺς ἄνδρας τοὺς ἐνήλικας καὶ δασυπύγους, οἱ φοιτῶντες διὰ τῆς νυκτὸς τὰ τοῦ Μίκωνος ῥαγίζονται, ἡγουν ἐσθίουσι, δηλονότι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ βινούμενοι. ... ἀλώπεξι δὲ εἶκασε τοὺς τοιοῦτους ὡς πανούργους καὶ δολερούς.

"I hate the shagtailed (foxes)": the interpretation which some give in terms of deep meaning is: I hate the men who are older and are hairy-bottomed, who frequent Micon over the night and gather, namely eat the grapes (of his youth), that is to say they are fucked by him ... (the author) compared these people to the foxes, as they are wicked and treacherous.

Of the same kind is the remark on l. 121 σκύλλας ἰὼν γραίας ἀπὸ σάματος αὐτίκα τίλλοις, "would you kindly run to a witch's grave and pick us some squills", where one of the scholia (c) comments:

σκύλλας ἰὼν γραίας: τοῦτό φησι κατὰ τὸ ἔσω νοούμενον· ἀπελθὼν τίλλε, φησί, τὰς παλαιὰς τρίχας τοῦ τάφου σου, ἡγουν τῆς πυγῆς σου.

⁵⁷ As observed by Gow *ad loc.*, a sexual sense is possible for διακαθαίρειν at Aristoph. *Ecl.* 847, but this meaning is not usually recorded by commentaries or lexica, and neither διακαθαίρειν nor καθαίρειν are included in Henderson's *The Maculate Muse*.

⁵⁸ Cf. *Id.* 1.48–51.

“run to a witch’s (grave) and (pick up) some squills”: this is what the author says in terms of deep meaning: go away and pluck the hairs of your tomb, namely of your ass.

See also *ad* l. 43 (μὴ βάθιον τήνω πυγίσματος, ὕβέ, ταφείης), where the commentator of Σc parallels his idiosyncratically hyper-obscene interpretation of the Theocritean ταφείης with Aristophanes:

μὴ ταφείης, ἀντὶ τοῦ γαμηθείης ... καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ ἐν Βατράχοις φησὶ περὶ τοῦ Κλέωνος [περὶ] τὸ κρυπτόμενον καὶ τὸ ἔνδον νοοῦμενον “ἐν ταῖς ταφαῖς τίλλεσθαι”, ἡγουν ἐν καιρῷ συνουσιασμοῦ τὰς τριχὰς ἐκτίλλειν τῆς πυγῆς.

“may you not be buried” instead of “be fucked” ... Aristophanes as well adopts about Cleon (sic) in the *Frogs* (ll. 423–424) the secret and inner sense of the phrase “plucking himself in the graveyard”, namely “to pluck the air of the arsehole” in the intercourse.

It comes as no surprise that *Id.* 5, the poem that is most ‘realistic’ about describing the rustic life of the shepherds, lends support to this reading approach. But the same approach can be found also in poems characterized by a more idealized perception of love, with the result that the ‘realistically’ raw idea of sex and love pervasively extends beyond the texts (or the passages in texts) in which Theocritus had more explicitly allowed for it. In *Id.* 11, for instance, modern scholars agree on a very innocent meaning for Theocritus’ comment on the foolish exhibition of love by the Cyclops in ll. 10–11: ἦρατο δ’ οὐ μάλοις οὐδὲ ῥόδῳ οὐδὲ κικίννοις / ἀλλ’ ὀρθαῖς μανίαις, “he wooed her, not with apples and roses and lovelocks, but with so fine a frenzy”. These datives are most likely instrumental, and Theocritus apparently ascribes to apples, roses and lovelocks the simple role of love-tokens. On the contrary, some commentator(s) of l. 10 interpreted the datives as causal: the apples would refer to the cheeks, the rose to the genitalia, and cheeks, vagina and curls would exemplify the single parts of the female body with which lovers (but not the ‘integralist’ Cyclops) normally fall in love:

ἦρατο δ’ οὐ μάλοις: ἠγάσθη δὲ οὐκ ἐλαφρῶς καὶ [τῶν] κατὰ μέρος αὐτῆς, (οὔτε κικίννων) οὔτε ῥόδων οὔτε μήλων· μήλων μὲν τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς ὤψεως, ῥόδων δὲ τῆς γυναικειᾶς ἡβης, ὅτι τὸ γυναικεῖον μόριον καὶ ῥόδον καὶ ῥοδωνιάν φασιν, ὡς Κρατῖνος ἐν Νεμέσει (*PCG* 116) (Σb, see also e).

“he loved not with apples”: he was in love not lightly, and only of some parts of her body—of her curls, roses or apples: “apples” means the cheeks in her face, the “roses” are the ones of the female youth, because the people call the female pudendum “rose” or “garden of roses”, like Cratinus in his *Nemesis*.

At the end of the same poem, there is the same scholarly consensus that Theocritus' half-jesting comment on the Cyclops' ability to 'nurture' his passion through the song, ῥᾶον δὲ διᾶγ' ἢ εἰ χρυσὸν ἔδωκεν (l. 81), has to mean "he found a readier cure than if he had paid hard cash" to a doctor, with a ring composition and a gentle teasing of his friend and doctor Nicias, who is the addressee of the opening dedication of the poem. But for the ancients, Theocritus conclusively 'lowered' the certain, though parodic, pathos of Cyclops' love, and expressed 'his' realistic voice: both of the scholia we have on the passage suppose that Theocritus is referring to the bribes through which the Cyclops might have tried to seduce an almost mercenary Galateia!:

ῥᾶον δὲ διᾶγεν: ῥᾶον δὲ διῆγεν ἄδων ἢ εἰ χρυσίον εἶχε δοῦναι, ὅπως πείσῃ τὴν Γαλάτειαν (Σb 11.81, see also c).

"and he fared easier": he fared easier by singing than if he had given money in order to persuade Galatea.

From the reference to Cratinus in Σ 11.10–11, and to Aristophanes in Σ 5.43 (both quoted above),⁵⁹ it is plausible to infer that all the sexual overinterpretations of Theocritus may belong to the same hand of a single commentator who was familiar with the typical reading approach practised by the interpreters of Aristophanes or of comic texts. In the same direction of a single hand we are led by the occurrence in Σ 5.43, 112–113, 121 of the expression τὸ ἔνδον / ἔσω νοούμενον, which appears to be attested nowhere else in Greek (to νοούμενον alone is also not common in the scholia, but especially frequent in the scholia to Aristophanes and to Homer). Though we cannot, thus, generalize, this possibly single attempt at a 'comic' reading not only, and more predictably, of *Id.* 5, but also of *Id.* 11 appears to be a strikingly synecdochical approach to the presentation of love in Theocritus' bucolic poems, which in my opinion may be intended to make more consistent Theocritus' differentiation from the pathetic/idealized idea of love in erotic poetry.

A further possible parallelism has to be highlighted between this special attention paid by Theocritus' commentator(s) to detecting suggestions of an easy-going idea of love as sex and the developments of bucolic experiments by the continuators of Theocritus. Indeed, these include one of the very few descriptions of full sexual satisfaction found in ancient literature (*Id.* 27). The ps.-Theocritean *Id.* 20 also stages a

⁵⁹ This parallelism was pointed out to me by Fausto Montana.

smiling 'decalage' of the pathos of the serenades of the Theocritean goatherd and Cyclops: the statement about his handsomeness, the reference to other girls interested in him, and the listing of the long series of reciprocated pastoral loves actually leads the oxherd-protagonist to a proud final denial of his love for the town-dwelling girl who has rejected his advances, unlike the final desperation of the Theocritean goatherd of *Id.* 3, who had uselessly quoted the same paradigms, or the final illusions of the Cyclops about his chances with other girls in *Id.* 11, or about his handsomeness in *Id.* 6. The rustic characters of post-Theocritean bucolic have learnt how to put into practice the 'authorial' lesson about how to be easy-going in love, which had been taught in part by the song of Simichidas-Theocritus in *Id.* 7.

In conclusion, the search for a strongly coherent bucolic Theocritus, in some cases more coherent than Theocritus himself might ever have tried to be, is clearly to be found in the approaches to the bucolic poems developed by at least some of their ancient commentators. And, as is easily to be seen from even a quick glance at the scholia to, e.g., Theocritus' epic poems, this search never informed the ancients' reading of these poems, most probably because in their case the identification of the genre coordinates was not a problem at all. This 'systematic' reading was an attempt at simplification, namely at establishing an organic, almost unilateral coherence. Although such coherence was nowhere to be found in Theocritus' texts themselves, readers were guided to look for it by what they sensed to be a striving after coherence, albeit a relative one, already in these texts.

It may be a bit too reductive to believe that all texts always contain in themselves "the image of the audience", and that this image actively affects the real audience by becoming for it a kind of normative code;⁶⁰ the dynamics of readers' response is often much more complex, and deconstructive. The main conclusion of my analysis is, however, that such a planning of readers' reactions appears not at all implausible in the poetics of Theocritus' bucolic texts in particular. The old question—did Theocritus invent the bucolic genre, or was it only his imitators that did so?—should be discarded in favour of the idea that Theocritus' bucolic texts already included the idea of a generic, self-sufficient coherence for their bucolic world, but commentators no less than imitators of his bucolic poems 'helped' him a great deal and

⁶⁰ Cf. Lotman (1982) 81.

further pursued the intentions of the original texts, in most cases in basically the same directions as Theocritus. Scholars, however, stopped their 'construction' sooner, anchored as they were in the pre-existing Theocritean texts, whereas imitators of every age, from the Hellenistic age to Virgil's time and beyond, would progressively standardize the full set of strictly coherent and invariable laws and conventions that were to characterize the world of future bucolic poetry.⁶¹

⁶¹ This paper profited from stimulating suggestions made by the audiences at seminars held at Harvard University and University College London; furthermore by D. Petrain, F. Montana, B.M. Palumbo Stracca, and T.D. Papangelis. The translations of Theocritus reproduce or presuppose with modifications the version by A. Rist (Chapel Hill 1978). Translations of the scholia are my own.

VIRGIL'S *ECL.* 1 AND THE ORIGINS OF PASTORAL

RICHARD HUNTER

The opening of *Ecl.* 1 is one of the most famous surprises in ancient literature. Virgil and his readers will have known *Id.* 1 as the first poem in whatever collection of Theocritus' poetry was familiar to them, and will have read that poem as both introductory and programmatic.¹ Virgil alludes to the opening of *Id.* 1 in the sound of l. 1, which mimics both the sound of the panpipes and the sound of *Id.* 1.1 (*Tityre tu ~ ἄδύ τι τό*), but he replaces the Theocritean exchange of compliments, in which both characters speak only of the other's matching accomplishments (*τύ ... τύ ... τέ; τεόν ... τύ ... τύ*), by a speech contrasting the interlocutor's situation with the speaker's own (*tu ... nos ... nos ... tu*), which is then followed by one entirely concerned with the second speaker's situation (*nobis ... mihi ... nostris ... meas*). The very sound of Virgilian 'bucolic' is both familiar and radically different, and not just because we are now hearing Latin rather than Greek.

Difference amidst the suspicion of sameness is the hallmark of Virgil's intertextuality with Theocritus. Thus, for example, the first speaker in Theocritus is, as we learn from his interlocutor's first verse (*Id.* 1.7), a shepherd; Tityrus, however, has sheep and cows. The second speaker in Theocritus is a goatherd (*Id.* 1.1); so is Meliboeus (l. 12). It is, however, a striking change that the opening Theocritean vocatives of occupation, αἰπόλε ... ὦ ποιμήν (*Id.* 1.1, 7), are replaced by the characters' names at the head of the first exchange, *Tityre ... o Meliboe* (ll. 1, 6).² Both modes function to create a world, but the nature of that world is importantly different. Put very baldly, Theocritus' fiction is of a new world of musical herdsmen, Virgil's of a now familiar, textual 'genre'; one might say that at the opening of *Id.* 1 we enter a world of bucolic mimesis,

¹ Cf. Gutzwiller (1996a), Hunter (1999) 60–61. Beyond the standard commentaries, I am conscious that my views of *Ecl.* 1 have been most shaped by Du Quesnay (1981) and Wright (1983); cf. also Cadili (2001) 26–34. I have tried not to overburden the notes of this short paper with references to the large modern bibliography on *Ecl.* 1, though I hope I have acknowledged debts where I am indeed conscious of them. A fuller version of this essay will appear in *The Shadow of Callimachus* (Cambridge UP, forthcoming).

² On names as markers at the head of poems cf. Clausen on *Ecl.* 1.1.

whereas at the opening of *Ecl.* 1 we enter a world of bucolic poetry, where all characters are given familiar or familiar-sounding names.³ This point is a familiar one, but the weight which “Tityrus” carries deserves repetition. τίτυρος can mean “reed, pipe” (Hesychius, *Lex.* τ 996–997 Schmidt), and the name thus forms a ring with *auena* around the opening couplet;⁴ as Theocritus had established the *syrinx* as the metonymic symbol of bucolic poetry, so Virgil goes one stage further and creates in “Tityrus” an almost eponymous figure who embodies his *Musa siluestris*, a figure of the contemporary world to match the legendary Comatas of *Id.* 7 (note *Id.* 7.88–89 ~ *Ecl.* 1.1–2).

The opening of *Id.* 1 is strikingly free of close verbal allusion to earlier poetry: it is the Doric linguistic texture and the simple subject-matter which matter most. Virgil’s opening, on the other hand, combines (at least) Theocritus, Meleager (cf. *AP* 7.196 = *HE* 4066ff.),⁵ and Lucretius (*siluestrem ... Musam* ~ *Lucr.* 4.589 etc.)⁶ to emphasise the (partly) familiar poetic world we are entering. Tityrus is a name we know from Theocritus, Meliboeus is not, but it is of a familiar kind (and may, of course, have appeared in post-Theocritean Greek bucolic).⁷ If Theocritus writes a paradoxical sense of timeless oral tradition into *Id.* 1,⁸ Virgil makes explicit the pre-existing and complex poetic tradition in which he places himself. It is that tradition which gives a particularly bitter power to the language of Meliboeus, who is leaving the pleasance and who thus embodies *Id.* 1’s ending (λήγειν) of bucolic song (*carmina nulla canam*), as Tityrus embodies its beginning (ἄρχειν). Shades of the Theocritean Daphnis’ death hover over the Latin goatherd’s exile (*Ecl.* 1.75–78 ~ *Id.* 1.116–117); *Ecl.* 5.43–44 is the Virgilian rewriting of Daphnis’ self-composed epitaph at *Id.* 1.120–121, but the whole of Meliboeus’ farewell is coloured by the sense of an ending. Meliboeus’ use of the ‘clichés’ of the bucolic world, with which we are (paradoxically) familiar but which he will know no more, shockingly brings the fantasies of pastoral into the real world and real time of the land confiscations. Thus,

³ With the exception of the poetic voice of poems 4, 6, and 8 there are no anonymous characters in the *Eclogues*.

⁴ Cf. Hunter (1999) 111 and Cairns (1999); see also Hubbard, this volume, p. 502.

⁵ For Meleagrian echoes in the opening verses of *Ecl.* 1 cf. Gutzwiller (1996b).

⁶ For Lucretian echoes in the opening verses of *Ecl.* 1 cf. Breed (2000), Lipka (2001) 66–68, Hardie, this volume, pp. 275 ff.

⁷ Its appropriately βουκολικόν nature is brought out particularly at *Ecl.* 3.1–2, where *pecus ... Meliboei ... Aegonis* allude to the three principal pastoral animals (sheep, cattle, goats).

⁸ Cf. Hunter (1999) 61.

nos patriae finis ... nos patriam fugimus mimics the repetitive, echoing style of bucolic, but in an entirely new, non-bucolic context, as *ipsae te, Tityre, pinus, / ipsi te fontes, ipsa haec arbusta uocabant* (ll. 38–39) offers a pathetic fallacy, in a situation hardly calling for pathos.⁹ So too, the description of the *locus amoenus* which Tityrus has secured (*Id.* 1.51–58) draws on the famous *locus amoenus* description in the mouth of Simichidas at the end of *Id.* 7, a description which, more than any other in Theocritus, revels in the fact that ‘nature’ is a construct of art; what Tityrus has secured, so Meliboeus reminds Tityrus and ourselves, is an imaginary construct with little purchase on reality. That this description contains the only example of the parenthetic word order which was to become a kind of signature of ‘modernist’ poetry, *raucae, tua cura, palumbes* (l. 57),¹⁰ is a further sign of how Meliboeus freights his description with the marks of pastoral art.

Virgil has made social status and secure rights in land an image for the making of pastoral verse (cf. esp. ll. 9–10, 70–78, etc.); a man such as Meliboeus who does not enjoy these privileges will not make poetry (*carmina nulla canam*). This is clearly a more complex situation than in Theocritus, where simple herding is the principal sign of song-making.¹¹ Virgil has superimposed agriculture—a mark of τέχνη and *cultus*—upon the simpler social pattern dominant in the Greek poems; there may be reasons for this in the realities of the Roman countryside, but it is also one further mark of the ‘second-order’ nature of Virgilian pastoral, an order characterised by a very self-conscious awareness of the countryside as a poetic construction. Meliboeus is dispossessed of his land, which is also his poetic inheritance; behind Virgil’s conception may lie the idea of the Greek κληρος, a word which covers “land” and “farm”, but also “inheritance” and “allotment”. Meliboeus’ land (his κληρος) would have been distributed to the veterans, as all of Virgil’s readers will have known, by “lot” (κληρος). It is perhaps at least worth considering the possibility that we should go further and see in Meliboeus’ fate the passage of pastoral verse-making from Greece to Rome (i.e. from Theocritus to Virgil) troped as ‘dispossession’, as loss

⁹ On the pathetic fallacy see Hunter (1999) 89, where it is noted that the trope “is ironised ... by Meliboeus as a generic marker”. Behind Meliboeus’ verses may lie *Epitaph for Bion* 88 Πίνδαρον οὐ ποθέοντι τόσον Βοιωτίδες ὕλαι, “not so much do the Boeotian woods long for Pindar”; commentators on *Ecl.* 1.38–39 normally cite Theocr. 4.12.

¹⁰ Cf. Clausen *ad loc.*, Solodow (1986).

¹¹ *Id.* 5.72–75 shows, however, that the matter was not entirely straightforward.

of the traditional land (κληρος); rights over that land are now very clearly controlled from Rome, and it is others who will exploit the products of Meliboeus' planting and agricultural labour (ll. 72–73). Two considerations might be thought to lend some colour to this suggestion.

The poet of the *Epitaph for Bion* forges a particular link between himself and the now dead master (ll. 93–97):

ἐν δὲ Συρακοσίοισι Θεόκριτος· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τοι
 Αὔσονικᾶς ὀδύνας μέλπω μέλος, οὐ ξένος ᾠδᾶς
 βουκολικᾶς, ἀλλ' ἄντε διδάξαι σεῖο μαθητὰς
 κλαρονόμος μοῖσας τᾶς Δωρίδος, ἧ με γεραίρων
 ἄλλοις μὲν τεὸν ὄλβον ἔμοι δ' ἀπέλειπες ἁοιδάν.

... among the Syracusans Theocritus.¹² But I sing a song of Ausonian grief; I am no stranger to bucolic song, but heir to the Dorian muse which you taught your pupils and with which you honoured me, leaving your wealth to others, but to me your song.

In the verses immediately preceding, the poet has claimed that, just as Bion is the new Homer (ll. 70–84), so all the cities of Greece mourn for Bion more than each of them grieves for their own famous poet (Lesbos for Alcaeus, Paros for Archilochus etc), as Homer too was famously claimed by many cities.¹³ The poet now apparently identifies himself as an Italian, i.e.—so l. 94 implies—a ξένος in one sense, though no ‘stranger’ to bucolic song. He is, on the most natural reading of l. 95, Bion’s pupil and heir (κλαρονόμος), to whom Bion has left his song, whereas to others he left his wealth; the idea of the ‘poor poet’ was by now a very familiar one (and one to which Theocritus had made a major contribution in *Id.* 16), but we should probably resist the temptation to see a resigned irony here (“all I got was poetry ...”). Textual problems and a probable lacuna prevent anything like certainty,¹⁴ but the whole passage seems to create a broad division into a Greek world (including Syracuse) and Italy; the point *may be* made that, unlike the cities of Greece, Italy has no great poets it is already mourning. The Greek poetic world teems with famous names, even if Bion outshines them all; Italy, however, is a void which must be filled, and this passage of the *Epitaph* runs together two ways of imaging that

¹² There is almost certainly a lacuna immediately before this verse; the poet is contrasting the universal grief for Bion with the particular grief felt by each locality for its own poet, cf. further below.

¹³ Ptolemy Philopator had built a shrine of Homer in which his image was encircled by all the cities which claimed him (Aelian, *VH* 13.22).

¹⁴ Cf. Gallavotti (1993) 369–371.

process of 'filling', namely the teacher-pupil relationship (l. 95) and the inheritance of Greek traditions (l. 96).¹⁵ This is not, of course, Virgilian 'dispossession', but a similar set of ideas is in play.

Secondly, there is Meliboeus' description of the new owner of the land (*Ecl.* 1.70–72):

*impius haec tam culta noualia miles habebit,
barbarus has segetes. en quo discordia ciuis
produxit miseros: his nos consequimur agros.*

A godless soldier will have my well tilled fields, a barbarian these crops of mine. See to what point civil strife has brought the wretched citizens: it is for these men we have planted our land.

Critics have concerned themselves with whether *barbarus* implies that the new owner was not an Italian citizen,¹⁶ or whether it is simply a term of abuse ("uncultured", "cruel") for someone who has earned his livelihood through killing people in civil war; either way, of course, *barbarus* plays off against *culta* to suggest *incultus* as another suitable term for the new owner. Be that as it may, *barbarus* is a very striking word to find here. βάρβαρος does not in fact occur in Greek bucolic, and is extremely rare in Hellenistic poetry generally,¹⁷ but Plautus notoriously has his (Greek) characters apply *barbarus* to things and people Roman. As he contemplates the takeover of his world, then, Meliboeus echoes a knowingly comic way of figuring the new rulers who know nothing of the *artes* of the countryside (and hence, as we have seen, nothing of the *ars* of poetry). The contrast between Roman military power (cf. *miles*) and the refined arts of Greece was of course to become a commonplace (cf. *Aen.* 6.847–853), but of particular interest are Horace's famous verses in the *Epistle to Augustus* (*Epist.* 2.1.156–160):

*Graecia capta ferum uictorem cepit et artis
intulit agresti Latio. sic horridus ille
defluxit numerus Saturnius et graue uirus
munditiae pepulere; sed in longum tamen aeuum
manserunt hodieque manent uestigia ruris.*

¹⁵ I have (very idly) wondered whether the poet of the *Epitaph* was a (native) Latin-speaker; is the curious φύγεν ᾠδάν in l. 112 a Latinism based on *fugare*? Cf. perhaps Catullus 68.25–26 on the result of his brother's death, *tota de mente fugauī / haec studia* (i.e. poetry and love). The language of the *Epitaph* is at least remarkable, although textual corruption is an ever-present possibility.

¹⁶ Cf. Keppie (1981) and Brunt (1971) 490, who point out that all the evidence is for the settlement of Italians.

¹⁷ Cf. Hunter in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 357.

Captured Greece took captive her savage conqueror and introduced the arts to rustic Latium. Thus the flow of that rough Saturnian rhythm disappeared and smart taste drove out the nasty poison; yet traces of the countryside remained for many a year and still remain today.

The Roman discourse of *rusticitas*, which was so prominent in comedy (cf. esp. Plautus, *Most.* 1 ff.), reappears in the *Eclogues* with a new and perhaps surprising sharpness.

Id. 1 offers both a cultural and a mythic *aition* for bucolic poetry, the former in a ritualised ‘goat song’ of rustics,¹⁸ the latter in the “sufferings of Daphnis”, both the first bucolic singer and the originary subject of bucolic song.¹⁹ In *Ecl.* 1 the beginnings of pastoral are to be sought, so the Lucretian echoes suggest, primarily in early man’s imitation of nature, although the motif, associated with Orpheus, of the great poet who teaches nature (l. 5) stresses that this is an art of which nature itself is a creation.²⁰ What, however, is given greater emphasis by Virgil is not the original beginning of bucolic so much as its surprising survival and/or revival (*pascite ut ante boues*). *Ecl.* 1 thus responds to the aetiology of *Id.* 1 with an aetiology for the ‘second birth’ of Theocritean poetry in an Italian setting and in the Latin language; or rather, it responds with two contrasting aetiologies: Meliboeus (cf. above) sees Roman pastoral as a takeover by the barbarians, a “barbarian translation” (*uortere barbare* as Plautus puts it) in two significant senses, whereas Tityrus sees it as a miracle worked by a benefactor. That miracle is, however, a complex one, and Tityrus’ aetiology may itself be analysed into the categories applicable to the aetiology of *Id.* 1. The ‘cultural’ *aition* of Roman pastoral lies no longer in the artistic recreation of primitive song, but rather in its literary counterpart—the allusive imitation of sophisticated Greek poetry; the ‘mythic’ *aition* is to be found in the oracular response of the Apolline *iuuenis*.

Tityrus’ benefactor, the *iuuenis* of the centre of the poem, and the manner of Tityrus’ thanks to him are in part modelled upon the Ptolemy Philadelphus of Theocritus’ *Id.* 17.²¹ The production of pastoral/bucolic requires peaceful occupation and utilisation of the land, such as the *iuuenis* grants Tityrus; for Meliboeus, however—in contrast

¹⁸ Cf. Hunter (1999) 61–62.

¹⁹ Virgil transmutes the ‘sufferings of Daphnis’ into *sollicitos Galli ... amores* (*Ecl.* 10.6).

²⁰ Cf. esp. *Epitaph for Bion* 45–49. On *Ecl.* 1.5 see esp. Breed (2000) 14–16; *Ecl.* 10.8 offers another version of the motif.

²¹ Cf. Hunter (2001).

to Theocritus' South Italian rustics who seem "completely immune from the ravages of war which affected the area in the third century"—²² *undique totis / usque adeo turbatur agris*, the land is occupied by impious and barbarian soldiers (ll. 70–71), and all of this means the impossibility of poetry. Here again it is Theocritus' Ptolemy who offers the positive model paradigm (*Id.* 17. 97–103):

... λαοὶ δ' ἔργα περιστέλλουσιν ἔκηλοι·
οὐ γάρ τις δηίων πολυκήτεα Νεῖλον ὑπερβάς
πεζὸς ἐν ἀλλοτρίαισι βοᾶν ἐστάσατο κώμαις,
οὐδέ τις αἰγιαλὸνδε θοᾶς ἐξήλατο ναός
θωρηχθεὶς ἐπὶ βουσὶν ἀνάρσιος Αἰγυπτίησιν·
τοῖος ἀνὴρ πλατέεσσιν ἐνίδρυται πεδίοισι
ξανθοκόμας Πτολεμαῖος, ἐπιστάμενος δόρυ πάλλειν.

undisturbed, his people tend their fields, for no foe crosses the swarming Nile to raise by land the cry of battle in villages that do not belong to him, and no enemy in armour leaps to the shore from a swift ship to harm the cattle of Egypt. So great a man is settled in the broad fields, fair-haired Ptolemy, skilled with the spear.

Virgil thus reads historical time and 'the political' back into *Id.* 1 by suggesting that Ptolemaic peace was necessary for the production of (bucolic) poetry; indeed, the whole of Theocritus' *Id.* 17 implicitly, and ll. 112–116 explicitly, do indeed suggest that the *pax Ptolemaica* and Ptolemaic εὐεργεσίη were both the necessary conditions for, and a direct cause of, poetic production. Tityrus has been blessed with the Roman equivalent of these ideal conditions.

Horace's later encomia of Augustus in *Odes* 4, which make important use of Theocritus' *Id.* 16 and 17,²³ can then be seen to resonate against the *Eclogues* as well. The rural peace of the *pax Augusta* (Horace, *C.* 4.5.29–32) resembles that of the *pax Ptolemaica*, as described by Theocritus:

*condit quisque diem collibus in suis
et uitem uiduas ducit ad arbores;
hinc ad uina redit laetus et alteris
te mensis adhibet deum.*

Each man passes the day on his own hills and marries the vine to spouseless trees; from there he returns joyfully to the wine-bowls and at the second course invokes you as a god.

²² Du Quesnay (1981) 36; cf. Hunter (1999) 131.

²³ Cf. Barchiesi (1996) 14–15.

The verses could almost describe Tityrus, whereas Meliboeus, cast out from “his own hills” and his own vines, can only dream of such good fortune; the differential fates of individuals caused by the land redistributions in the wake of impious civil war have been miraculously righted by the bountiful and universal (*condit quisque ...*) peace of the emperor Augustus.

The peaceful freedom which allows Tityrus to make pastoral music has a name, *otium* (l. 6), a resonant condition²⁴ picked up again as the end of the *Georgics* echoes and refers to the opening of the *Eclogues* (G. 4.563–566):

*illo Vergilium me tempore dulcis alebat
Parthenope studiis florentem ignobilis oti,
carmina qui lusi pastorum audaxque iuuenta,
Tityre, te patulae cecini sub tegmine fagi.*

At that time sweet Parthenope nursed me, Virgil, as I luxuriated in the pursuits of leisure which brings no glory; I am he who played the songs of shepherds and who, when reckless with youth, sang you, Tityrus, under the protection of the beech tree.

In one of the most familiar tropes for creativity (cf. again *Epitaph for Bion* 58–63), the final couplet depicts the Virgil of the *Eclogues* as ‘a pastoral poet’ in both senses, i.e. both a poet whose characters are musical shepherds and who is himself a musical shepherd (for *ludere* cf. *Ecl.* 1.6, 6.1); the syntax of the final verse leaves open whether it was Tityrus or Virgil who was *patulae ... sub tegmine fagi*. This passage, moreover, seems to play with an identification, one apparently made very early in Virgilian criticism, between Virgil and his character “Tityrus”: the passage both gestures towards that identification—Virgil and Tityrus both enjoy an *otium* which depends upon the actions of a quasi-divine figure—and teasingly rejects it (*Vergilium me ... Tityre te*), words which may themselves recall the interplay of first and second-person pronouns at the head of *Ecl.* 1 (cf. above). Virgil had, of course, at least encouraged the identification as early as the opening of *Ecl.* 6, where, as a result of the instructions of Apollo, he makes a kind of music which ornately echoes that of Tityrus (6.8 ~ 1.2). Apollo speaks in *Ecl.* 6 in the same riddling language of animal husbandry as does the *iuuenis* of *Ecl.* 1; the two ‘patronage/initiation’ narratives of *Ecl.* 1 and 6 tell the same

²⁴ As is well known, *otium* can be a good to be pursued or a waste to be disparaged, according to cultural and rhetorical circumstances. The matter cannot be pursued at length here, cf. Kroll (1924) 2 n. 5, Toner (1995).

story in different conventional and/or allusive modes.²⁵ The oracular response of *Ecl.* 1 and Apollo's intervention at the head of the second half of the book of *Eclogues* are thus parallel 'mythic *aitia*' for Roman pastoral, explaining why the *Eclogues* are the first Theocritean verse in Latin.²⁶

In an important study of *Ecl.* 5, Ian Du Quesnay sought to distinguish between "an allegory in the crude sense that Daphnis [in *Ecl.* 5] 'really is' the historical person C. Julius Caesar" and a mode in which a figure of myth (such as Daphnis) can be presented in such a way as to suggest or hint at (in Greek αἰνέεσθαι) a contemporary figure, as, for example, Philoxenus' Cyclops was read as 'hinting at' Dionysius of Syracuse.²⁷ This distinction might seem to be merely a question of semantic definition, though for Du Quesnay clearly more is at stake: "the concept of pastoral allegory or masquerade, so familiar to the modern reader, does not appear to have been available as a concept to Virgil". Whatever we may think of this apparent prescription for what Virgil could and could not do, there is no reason to suspect that the predominant view of ancient scholarship (and of the author of the *Syrinx*) that the speaker of *Id.* 7 is Theocritus, though called Simichidas for some reason (which was indeed the object of dispute), was not known to, and perhaps shared by, Virgil;²⁸ the Roman poet was thus all but certainly familiar with a tradition of bucolic interpretation in which the poet referred to himself by other names and put his 'real life' experiences into his poetry. So, at the end of *Ecl.* 5 he identifies himself with the Menalcas of that poem (ll. 85–87), just as certain things about Tityrus in poem 1 suggest the historical Virgil (just as certain things also do not). The surprise of *Ecl.* 1 in fact marks a fundamental step beyond Theocritus in the nature of how the pastoral poet sites himself through his characters, though one which takes its start from the Greek poet

²⁵ On the narrative of *Ecl.* 1 cf. Hunter (2006).

²⁶ For this conventional claim of primacy cf. Kroll (1924) 12–13, Clausen *ad loc.*, Nisbet and Hubbard on Hor. *C.* 1.26.10, Fedeli on Propertius 3.13. Others (e.g. Coleman *ad loc.*) understand the opening of *Ecl.* 6 to mean "My Muse first ...", i.e. the *Eclogues* (particularly *Ecl.* 1–5) were Virgil's first poetry. It may well be that such a sense resonates, but the claim to primacy suits both the pattern I have been tracing and the rhetoric of *Ecl.* 6.1–12.

²⁷ Du Quesnay (1976/77) 30.

²⁸ We may on the other hand prefer to place the identification of the goatherd of *Id.* 3 as Theocritus (Σ *arg.*, and on ll. 8–9a.) to a period later than Virgil; cf. further Fantuzzi, this volume, pp. 254–255. On competing modes of reading Theocritus in the imperial age cf., e.g., Gutzwiller (1991) 179–181.

and from developments in Greek bucolic after Theocritus;²⁹ biographical interpretation is thus put at the heart of the *Eclogues*.

Du Quesnay's stress on the mythic nature of the characters who hint at contemporaries is, however, an important one. Virgil's pastoral characters themselves have something like mythic depth because of his exploitation of a previously known poetic world, in contrast to Theocritus' creative mimesis (cf. above). Just as the world of myth can be used, as for example in Attic tragedy, to reflect and reflect upon contemporary events, so Virgil's inherited pastoral space-time can, when the poet wishes, be shaped in 'modern' and suggestive ways. *Ecl.* 10 is a witness to these developments of a very special kind. Whatever Gallan poetry lies behind this poem, Gallus is here made to suggest the Daphnis of *Id.* 1, rather than—as in the more normal mode—the mythical character being shaped to suggest a historical one; thus the two halves of the book of *Eclogues* are closed, as they are also opened, by poems which offer different kinds of biographical reading, and make this mode absolutely central to the project of the *Eclogues*. This may well not be 'allegory', but it would be a serious mistake not to see in this a very distinctive step beyond the modes which Virgil inherited; hindsight, of course, allows us to see just how important this step was for the subsequent pastoral tradition.

Richard Thomas has interestingly argued that we should understand that the whole of *Ecl.* 6, including ll. 1–12, is spoken not by 'the poet' (whom I shall continue to call Virgil), but rather by (the Virgilian character) Tityrus.³⁰ The argument is suggestive, but it may be that we do not have to make the choice in those terms. We should not overstate the difference between the address of the Virgilian Apollo to *pastor Tityrus* and that of his Callimachean model, who addresses the poet as ἀοιδέ. If Callimachus' verses recall his first writing lesson at school,³¹ then his Apollo's riddling admonition gives the young boy both his future profession, poetry (ἀοιδή), and the style in which he is to practise that profession ("the slender Muse"). The speaker of *Ecl.* 6, however, was about to write epic, i.e. was already an ἀοιδός, when Apollo intervened, like his Callimachean predecessor, to produce both the subject-matter and the style of the early compositions referred to

²⁹ Cf., e.g., Gutzwiller (1991) 177–179, Alpers (1996) 153–161. For the influence of Servius on subsequent consideration of this difference cf., e.g., Patterson (1987) 32–34.

³⁰ Thomas (1998).

³¹ So, e.g., Massimilla (1996) 217.

in ll. 1–2 (presumably (?) *Ecl.* 1–5, with *Ecl.* 6.2 varying the *siluestris Musa* of *Ecl.* 1.2).³² We do not in fact expect the oracular and riddling god to address someone by their real name, and so we are perhaps to understand that “Tityrus” is a (typically bucolic) name given to the poet by the god, as the god imposes a change of direction from epic to pastoral; in this fiction, the name was then adopted by the poet for one of the characters in *Ecl.* 1—unsurprisingly, the character who is most easily taken for the poet himself.³³ If there is anything in this suggestion, Virgil may, as so often, have here picked up a hint from Theocritus. In *Id.* 7, “Simichidas” is the first word spoken by the quasi-divine Lycidas (l. 21) and the first we hear of the narrator’s name; the name also closes a ring around Lycidas’ opening speech (l. 50). Its only other occurrence is then as the first word of the narrator’s song (l. 96). The name is a notorious puzzle to both ancient and modern scholars, but Virgil may have ‘read’ it as a name given to the poet (Theocritus) by an initiating god; both poets then wisely follow the divine nomenclature.³⁴ Both the name and the procedure are thus potently appropriate Theocritean elements at the heart of Virgil’s reworking of Callimachus.

³² This seems a more plausible reading than to assume that the early bucolic phase (ll. 1–2) preceded the intention to write epic and Apollo’s intervention.

³³ In Propertius’ imitation (3.3) of Callimachus’ fr. 1 and Virgil’s *Ecl.* 6, Apollo addresses the poet as *Properti* (l. 17): this makes the same generic point as Virgil’s Apollo, as “Propertius” there implies “Propertius, famous for love poetry”. It is tempting to see in Propertius another early reader who glossed “Tityrus” in *Ecl.* 6 as “Virgil”. It is also worth recalling that Τίτυρος is a name for a Silenus-like figure in the retinue of Dionysus (Strabo 10.3.7, 15, Aelian, *VH* 3.40, Σ Theocr. 3.2), and is thus quite appropriate to the song of Silenus which he proceeds to sing.

³⁴ Simichidas claims, of course, that he ‘wrote’ the song before meeting Lycidas, but that would at least not stop Virgil from appropriating and sharpening this pattern.

CULTURAL AND HISTORICAL NARRATIVES IN VIRGIL'S *ECLOGUES* AND LUCRETIIUS

PHILIP HARDIE

The importance of Lucretius for the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid* has been thoroughly charted. A number of studies have brought out Virgil's intensive engagement with the *De Rerum Natura* at various points in the *Eclogues*, and it is no surprise that a poet for whose youthful commitment to Epicureanism there is strong biographical evidence should early have been fascinated by Lucretius' poem. Yet differences of genre and purpose between the *De Rerum Natura* and the *Eclogues* might appear to militate against more than incidental contacts between the two works. In what follows I aim to show not only that in his first major work Virgil already practises a far-reaching and sustained dialogue with Lucretius, but that this is conducted in areas where the didactic and pastoral projects might seem most alien to each other.

Specifically I shall show how, on to the local rhythms of the pastoral world, regulated by the alternation of day and night and only intermittently open to the more momentous temporal patterns of the world outside the green cabinet, there is imposed a larger set of temporal narratives, histories of large-scale process and change, of a kind central to Lucretius' interests. These operate at the level both of the individual, who grows up and is educated (the Lucretian didactic addressee, a 'child' afraid of the dark who must be educated into enlightenment), and of the race (for Lucretius the historical appearance of Epicurus is the transforming climax of the history of civilization narrated in the latter part of *De Rerum Natura* 5). Lucretius is also a source for the Virgilian analogy between the history of the individual and the history of the race: the language used of the gradual progress of civilization at the end of *De Rerum Natura* 5 is closely paralleled in programmatic admonitions in the first book to the didactic addressee to make progress.¹

¹ With Lucr. 5.1454–1457 (history of civilization) *sic unum quicquid paulatim protrahit aetas / in medium ratioque in luminis erigit oras. / namque alid ex alio clarescere corde uidebant, / artibus ad summum donec uenere cacumen*, "thus time gradually dragged forth each thing plain to see and reason lifted it into the shores of light. For with their minds they saw

One result of this exposure of pastoral to the poem of Lucretius is to constitute pastoral poetry itself as a product of a Lucretian historical narrative. A second result is to expand the ways in which the *Eclogues* already anticipate the themes of historical process and change in Virgil's later works.²

1. *Lucretian bookends*

The importance of Lucretius for the *Eclogues* is signalled by the fact that the book opens and closes with Lucretian allusion. The first line of the first *Eclogue* already contains verbal parallels with the *De Rerum Natura*.³ The *siluestris Musa* which Meliboeus ascribes to Tityrus in the second line of *Ecl.* 1, and which functions almost as a title for the book as a whole, is a phrase from Lucretius' discussion of the delusory effects of echo in the countryside, 4.589 *fistula siluestrem ne cesset fundere musam*, "so that the pipe should not cease to pour forth the woodland Muse".⁴ The variant on this phrase, *agrestis Musa*, with which Virgil

one thing made clear by another, until through the arts they reached the highest peak", cf. 1.114–117 (progress of the didactic addressee) *haec sic pernosces parua perductus opella; / namque alid ex alio clarescet nec tibi caeca / nox iter eripiet, quin ultima naturai / peruideas: ita res accendent lumina rebus*, "if you take a little trouble, you will attain to a thorough understanding of these truths. For one thing will be illumined by another, and eyeless night will not rob you of your road till you have looked into the heart of nature's darkest mysteries. So surely will facts throw light upon facts", and 1.407–409 *sic alid ex alio per te tute ipse uidere / talibus in rebus poteris caecasque latebras / insinuare omnis et uerum protrahere inde*, "so in such questions one thing will lead on to another, till [like a keen-scented hunting dog] you can succeed by yourself in tracking down the truth to its lurking-places and dragging it forth".

² For some account of Lucretian temporality in the *Georgics* see Hardie (2005b) 23–32.

³ Line 1 *sub tegmine (caeli)*: Lucr. 2.663, 5.1016, but also in Cicero's poetry and possibly Ennian (see Clausen on *Ecl.* 1.1); Giesecke (2000) 48 notes the quasi-pastoral context of flocks and water at Lucr. 2.663. *recubans*: Lucr. 1.38 *hunc tu, diua, tuo recubantem corpore sancto*, "as he reclines on your sacred body, goddess" (the only occurrence of the word in Lucretius); Clausen notes "*recubo* is a rather unusual verb, here perhaps with a connotation of luxurious ease", citing Cic. *De or.* 3.63 (Cyrenaic philosophy personified) *in hortulis quiescet suis ... ubi etiam recubans molliter et delicate nos auocat a rostris*, "she will rest in her little garden, where, reclining in soft luxury, she also distracts us from the rostra"; see also Martini (1986) 307–308. Virgil hints at a community of spirit between Tityrus' pastoral world and hedonistic philosophies, of a kind that has often been noted. Modern readers like to hear an echo of the first line of Theocritus' *Id.* 1 in the sound effects of the first line of the *Eclogues*; might we also catch an echo of an address to *Tite Lucreti Care* in *Tityre, tu patulae recubans ...?*

⁴ *siluestris/agrestis Musa* also alludes to a Hellenistic model, Meleager, *AP* 7.1966.2 =

defines his own poetic field and thereby inaugurates the second half of the book at *Ecl.* 6.8 *agrestem tenui meditabor harundine Musam*, “I shall practise the rustic Muse on a slender reed”, is found in the course of Lucretius’ history of civilization, in his account of the invention of human music in a tuneful rustic landscape (5.1379–1407), at 1398 *agrestis enim tum musa uigebat*, “for then the rustic Muse flourished”.

At the end of *Ecl.* 10 a harmful shade prompts the pastoral singer to rise to higher things, 75–76 *surgamus: solet esse grauis cantantibus umbra, / iuniperi grauis umbra; nocent et frugibus umbrae*, “let us arise: shade is liable to harm singers, the harmful shade of the juniper; shade harms the crops too”. This is a Lucretian shadow, cast by a discussion of naturally occurring exhalations harmful to human senses, which is designed to show that the deadly effects of lake Avernus are themselves of a purely materialist nature, 6.783–785:

*arboribus primum certis grauis umbra tributa
usque adeo, capitis faciant ut saepe dolores,
siquis eas subter iacuit prostratus in herbis.*⁵

Firstly certain trees possess a shade so harmful that they often cause headache if someone lies stretched out on the grass under them.

This is the kind of tree from under which the makers of a primitive pastoral poetry at the end of book 5 might well wish to rise: 5.1392–1393 *saepe itaque inter se prostrati in gramine molli / propter aquae riuum sub ramis arboris altae* ..., “so, often stretched out together on the soft grass by a stream of water under the branches of a high tree” (~ 2.29–30). Virgil may have been further encouraged to make a connection between Lucretius’ harmful shade and poetry by the lines that follow in book 6.786–787 *est etiam magnis Heliconis montibus arbor / floris odore hominem taetro consueta necare*, “there is also in the great mountains of Helicon a tree with the property of killing a man with the foul smell of its flower”.⁶ But the threat of a headache, rather than of a death in

HE 4067 ἀγρονόμαν μέλπεις μουσαν (you sing of the rural Muse): see Gutzwiller (1998) 320–321.

⁵ Bailey on Lucr. 6.783, followed by Coleman on *Ecl.* 10.76, cites Pliny, *NH* 17.89 (in a chapter on the properties, harmful or not, of the shade of various trees) on walnut-trees (*iuglandes*) *grauis et noxia etiam capiti humano omnibusque iuxta satis*, “their shade is harmful and noxious even to people’s heads and to all crops nearby”. See below, Schiesaro’s contribution to this volume, pp. 430–436.

⁶ These noxious plants are in contrast to the trees and flowers of Helicon that mark the successful singer at Lucr. 1.118 *detulit ex Helicone perenni fronde coronam*. “[Ennius] brought down from Helicon a garland of evergreen foliage”, and 1.928–929 *inuatque*

aromatic pain, may be enough to silence a pastoral singer: Theocr. 3.52 ἀλγέω τὰν κεφαλάν, τιν δ' οὐ μέλει. οὐκέτ' αἰίδω, "my head aches, but you don't care. I'll sing no more". *carmina nulla canam*, "I will sing no more songs", as Meliboeus says at the end of *Ecl.* 1 (l. 77). Theocritus' petulant singer says that he will lie where he falls, *Id.* 3.53 κεισεῦμαι δὲ πεσών, "I will lie where I have fallen"; at the end of the last *Eclogue* Virgil, sadder and wiser perhaps after what he has learned about love, will rise up (l. 75 *surgamus*).⁷

2. Life-histories of the race and of the individual

Tityrus will rise in more ways than one. There is a generic elevation, from pastoral to didactic. Also implied is a key stage in the ascent of man: as he moves on from the *Eclogues* to the *Georgics*, Virgil lifts his strain from the minimalist, quasi-Golden Age society of pastoral to the more complex social structures of a late-coming Iron Age. What of the poet's own career? Should we see the passage from pastoral to georgic as the sign of a poetic maturation, as the poet 'grows up', leaving behind the games and rash exuberance of his youth (*G.* 4.565 *carmina qui lusi pastorum audaxque iuuenta* ..., "I who played at shepherd's songs, and emboldened with youth ..."), on course to gird himself like a man (*G.* 3.46) for the fully adult enterprise of the epic *Aeneid*?

The harmful effects of shade occur again in a context that links a history of the individual to an implicit history of the race near the beginning of the second *Georgic* (ll. 47–59):

nouos decerpere flores / insignemque meo capiti petere inde coronam, "I delight in plucking new flowers and seeking thence a famous garland for my head", a headache cure, if anything. It is intriguing (but perhaps no more), given the Arcadian setting of *Ecl.* 10, that Bailey's parallels at *Lucr.* 6.786 include Pliny, *NH* 16.51 *milacem ... esse in Arcadia tam praesentis ueneni, ut qui obdormiant sub eo cibumue capiant moriantur*, "there is a smilax in Arcadia of such strong poison that those who fall asleep or eat a meal under it, die".

⁷ Theocritus' *Id.* 3 does more work in the opening and closing scenes of the *Eclogues*: (i) *Ecl.* 1: at the beginning of *Id.* 3 the unnamed goatherd is in conversation with a Tityrus; he sings, in an attempt to woo Amaryllis, as he reclines by a pine (3.38), the bucolic cliché represented by Tityrus at the beginning of *Ecl.* 1, teaching the woods to echo "Amaryllis". (ii) *Ecl.* 10 has been "sung" while the goats were feeding (l. 7): cf. *Id.* 3.1–3. Meliboeus' assertion that he will stop singing is mirrored in the cessation of all pastoral singing at the end of *Ecl.* 10, l. 70, and Meliboeus' despairing cry to his goats at l. 74 *ite meae, felix quondam pecus, ite capellae!* is echoed in 'Virgil's' final command to his goats in the last line of *Ecl.* 10, 77 *ite domum saturae, uenit Hesperus, ite capellae*.

*sponte sua quae se tollunt in luminis oras,
infecunda quidem, sed laeta et fortia surgunt;
quippe solo natura subest. tamen haec quoque, si quis
inserat aut scrobibus mandat mutata subactis,
exuerint siluestrem⁸ animum, cultuque frequenti
in quascumque uoces artis haud tarda sequuntur.
nec non et, sterilis quae stirpibus exit ab imis,
hoc faciat, uacuos si sit digesta per agros;
nunc altae frondes et **rami matris opacant**
crescentique adimunt fetus uruntque ferentem.
iam quae seminibus iactis se sustulit arbos,
tarda uenit seris factura nepotibus **umbram**,
pomaque degenerant sucos oblita priores.⁹*

Those trees which spontaneously rise into the shores of light are infertile, to be sure, but they rise strong and hardy; for a natural force is in the soil. But these too, if one were to graft them or transplant them into well-worked trenches, will put off their wild spirit, and by constant cultivation they will readily submit to whatever accomplishments you summon them to. An infertile sucker shooting from the base of a trunk would do likewise, if it were planted out in an empty plot; as it is the lofty leaves and branches of its mother overshadow it, depriving the growing plant of fertility and blighting its productivity. And the tree that shoots up from dispersed seeds grows slowly, to provide shade for generations far in the future, and its fruits degenerate, forgetting their previous sap.

Spontaneously growing plants are ‘educated’ through transplantation into culture and the arts, like Lucretius’ primitive man coming out of the woods into an age of agriculture and arts. Suckers are children that need to be planted out, or else they will atrophy in their mother’s shade.¹⁰

⁸ Lucretius uses *siluestris* of the environment of primitive man: 5.948, 967, 970, 1245, 1411. Cf. Lucr. 5.1361–1378 on the spread of agriculture, as the *siluae* (1370) retreat up the mountains before the advance of *cultura agelli* (1367), and *fructusque feros mansuescere*, “the wild fruits grow tame” (1368); the paragraph beginning 1361–1362 *at specimen sationis et insitionis origo / ipsa fuit rerum primum natura creatrix*, “but in the beginning nature herself, the mother of things, was the model for sowing and the origin of grafting”, is a model for the whole of this Virgilian passage.

⁹ See Gale (2000) 161 n. 49 on the danger of shade here and at *G.* 1.121 and 2.410, noting the connection with *Ecl.* 10.75–76.

¹⁰ But note the irony of Virgil’s self-description in the *sphragis* to the *Georgics*: he looks back to the youthful exploits of the *Eclogues*, but as author of the *Georgics* is still at an infantile stage, at least compared to the true epic *uir* Caesar: see *G.* 4.563–564 *illo Vergilium me tempore dulcis alebat / Parthenope studiis florentem ignobilis oti*, “at that time sweet Parthenope nurtured me, Virgil, blooming in the pursuits of my inglorious leisure”, where Virgil figures himself in the epithalamial image of the virginal flower, still in a mother’s embrace; cf. *Cat.* 64.87–88 (Ariadne) *quam suauis exspirans castus odores / lectulus*

The last in the list of pests that afflict the farmer at *G.* 1.119–121 is shade (*umbra nocet*). The focus is then immediately widened to the largest cultural history with the words *pater ipse colendi / haud facilem esse viam uoluit*, “the father himself did not wish the path of agriculture to be easy”, introducing the ‘theodicy’ and the invention of agriculture through the educational programme of Jupiter’s school of hard knocks.¹¹ Reading back, this sequence hints at a movement at the end of the *Eclogues* larger than simply that from one stage of the poet’s career to the next, a movement rather from one stage of civilization to the next, from life in the woods to the life of agriculture.

The idea that bucolic poetry originates in the infancy of mankind, and that Virgil’s career itself mirrors the development of human culture, was to be explicitly formulated by Donatus, and received schematic representation in the medieval *rota Vergilii* (Donatus, *Vita Verg.* 23–24 Diehl¹²):

quae cum omnia dicantur, illud erit probabilissimum, bucolicum carmen originem ducere a priscis temporibus, quibus uita pastoralis exercita est, et ideo uelut aurei saeculi speciem in huiusmodi personarum simplicitate cognosci, et merito Vergilium processurum ad alia carmina non aliunde coepisse nisi ab ea uita, quae prima in terra fuit. nam postea rura culta et ad postremum pro cultis et feracibus terris bella suscepta. quod uidetur Vergilius in ipso ordine operum suorum uoluisse monstrare, cum pastores primo, deinde agricolas canit et ad ultimum bellatores.

When all that has been said, the most likely explanation is that bucolic poetry originated in primitive times, when the pastoral life was pursued, and for that reason an image as it were of the golden age is discernible in the simplicity of characters of this kind; and since Virgil was going to go on to other kinds of poetry, he rightly took as his starting point the kind of life that was first found on earth. For later mankind took up agriculture, and finally, in place of tilled and fertile fields, warfare. Virgil appears to have wished to illustrate this in the order itself of his works, seeing that he sings first of herdsmen, next of farmers, and finally of warriors.

This version of the origin of bucolic is not recorded in ancient literary scholarship before Donatus, but it is possible that Lucretius alludes

in molli complexu matris alebat, “nurtured in the soft embrace of her mother on a chaste couch that breathed forth sweet scents”.

¹¹ Note also the ring-composition at the end of the theodicy, 1.155–157 *nisi ... ruris opaci / falce premes umbras*, *eqs.*, “unless you cut back the shade that darkens the countryside with a pruning-hook, etc.”.

¹² See Gutzwiller (1991) 184–185, pointing to the importance of Donatus’ statement for the later theory of pastoral.

to such a reconstruction in his account of the origin of human music-making at *De Rerum Natura* 5.1379–1407, which seems to tell of the origins of what will become the genre of pastoral.¹³ And if Lucretius is not himself thinking in generic categories, what Virgil does in his allusion to the Lucretian *agrestis Musa* will retrospectively make of Lucretius' rustic music-making the origins of the genre of the *Eclogues* (see below).

A Renaissance imitator of Virgil takes the hint, and shows how ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny in his parallel accounts of the history of Latin poetic culture and of the history of the individual poet. Here is Girolamo Vida on the beginnings of Latin poetry (*De arte poetica* 1.149–153, 161–163), weaving Virgilian floscules onto the ground of a Lucretian cultural history:

*nostrī autem ut sanctum diuās Heliconā colentes
coeperunt primum in Latium transferre, fluebant
uersu incomposito informes, artisque Pelasgae
indociles Musa fundebant carmina agrestī
siluicolas inter Faunos¹⁴ ...
atque ita deinde rudes paulatim sumere uersus¹⁵
coeperunt formam insignem, penitusque Latini
agrestem exuerunt morem, eqs.*

But when our poets first began to import into Latium the goddesses that dwell on sacred Helicon, they flowed in shapeless and clumsy verse, and untrained in Greek art they poured forth songs of a rustic muse, amidst the woodland Fauns [before Ennius sought the glory of a Greek poetic crown] ... And then gradually the rough verses began to take on clear shape, and the Latin poets thoroughly shed their rustic character [with the final appearance of Virgil], etc.

And here is Vida's advice to the boy starting out on a poetic career (1.459–461):

¹³ On the poetic and mythological allusions in the Lucretian passage see Gale (1994) 133–136; Buchheit (1984). Despite its title Gillis (1967) has little specific to say on Lucretius and the genre of pastoral; he refers to an unpublished essay by P. de Lacy on "Lucretius' Debt to Greek Pastoral Poetry". On Ovid's allusion in the Syrinx episode in *Met.* 1 to the Lucretian account of the invention of pastoral as the original form of music (filtered through allusion to the *Eclogues*) see Fabre-Serris (2003).

¹⁴ Vida uses a Virgilian phrase (*Aen.* 10.551 *siluicolae Fauno*), but remembers the Fauns at *Lucr.* 4.581; and behind both Virgil and Lucretius he alludes to Ennius, *Ann.* 207 *Skutsch uorsibus quos olim Faunei uatesque canebant*, "in verses which once the Fauns and bards sang".

¹⁵ *Ecl.* 6.36 *coeperit et rerum paulatim sumere formas*; *paulatim* also occurs at *Lucr.* 5.1388 in the Lucretian history of rustic music (the line, excised in modern editions, will have stood in the text available to Vida). *paulatim* occurs twice in *Ecl.*; twice in *G.*; 7 times in *Aen.*

*sed neque inexpertus rerum iam texere longas
audeat Iliadas. paullatim assuescat, et ante
incipiat graciles pastorum inflare cicutas.*

but let not the unskilled boy yet dare to compose long Iliads. Let him gain experience gradually, and first start to blow on the shepherds' slender pipes.

For Vida pastoral song marks the childhood both of Italian civilization and of the poet. This is indeed a favourite Virgilian analogy: *Ecl.* 4, after all, maps the history of the world on to the life-history of a child, and in the *Aeneid* the maturation—and education—of the epic hero also carries a message about a much larger history. Among other sources for the biological model of history, Virgil takes a hint from Lucretius who, as noted above, suggests an analogy between the large-scale progress of civilization and the individual progress of the addressee, for whom to read the *De Rerum Natura* is to put behind him the fears and ignorance of childhood.¹⁶

3. *Childish poetics and teachers*

In this section I take a closer look at didacticism in the *Eclogues* and at the figure of the boy as subject of instruction. The *Eclogues* are a young man's poetry with a largely boyish cast of characters. A fair amount of teaching takes place in the *Eclogues*, some of it directed at boys, some of it not. The Greek bucolic tradition already offers a cast of boys and scenes of instruction; Virgil takes these over, and forges new links with the teaching situations and audiences of Lucretius. At the end of the *Eclogues* the poet is ready to graduate to the more advanced didacticism of the *Georgics*.

The 'childishness' of Theocritus' bucolic poetry is emblemized in the *ekphrasis* of the boy weaving a cricket trap on the cup at Theocr. 1.45–54, "an image of the bucolic poet, constructing something beautiful from 'natural materials'".¹⁷ Generally Theocritus shares the newness, smallness, and (apparent) unpretentiousness of a 'childish' poetics with other Hellenistic poets, such as Callimachus "rolling out his little

¹⁶ The analogy also has Catullan precedents (esp. Cat. 64), highlighted by Petrini (1997).

¹⁷ Hunter (1999) on 1.45–54, referring to Cairns (1984) 103–104; Goldhill (1987) 2. On the poetics of childishness see also Morgan (2003).

epos like a child” (*Aitia* fr. 1.5–6 Pfeiffer = Massimilla). More particularly this is the poetics of a genre, bucolic, that deals in the simple world of naive country folk. This is a world in which the epic Polyphemus is still an adolescent (*Id.* 11.9) who has not yet detached himself from his mother’s apron-strings (*Id.* 11.67–71). The singers of the ‘masque’ of the young Polyphemus in *Id.* 6 are themselves in first adolescence or early youth (6.2–3); both singers in the post-Theocritean *Id.* 8, imitating *Id.* 6, have the down of first adolescence (8.3), and are labelled παῖδες (8.28, 81).

The young singers of *Id.* 8 have already learned to be expert at piping and singing (8.4 συρίσδεν δεδαημένω), and are themselves qualified to teach others their art: at the end the goatherd who has been called in to umpire their contest asks the victorious Daphnis to teach him, offering him a goat as his fee (8.86 δίδακτρα). *Id.* 7 is a complex dramatisation of the process of learning to be, of being initiated as, a bucolic poet; Simichidas, addressed by Lycidas as a “young shoot” (7.44 ἔρως) boasts that he has already been taught poetry (7.92 Νύμφαι κῆμὲ δίδασξαν ἄν’ ὄρεα βουκολέοντα, “the Nymphs taught me too as I herded my cattle in the mountains” (cf. Hesiod, *Theog.* 22–23). That claim suggests that an origin of bucolic may be located in the didactic poetry of Hesiod.¹⁸

Hesiod figures overtly in the climactic scene of poetic initiation in *Ecl.* 6 when Linus announces to Gallus that the Muses are giving him the pipes that they once gave to “the Ascrean old man”. Whatever one makes of the initiation of Gallus in terms of generic categories, one of the meanings of the naming of Hesiod, in the context of a book of pastoral poems, is a recognition of the Hesiodic origin that Simichidas declares for his entry into bucolic. A less overt allusion to Hesiod has been detected in the programmatic command of the *iuuenis* of *Ecl.* 1 to

¹⁸ Bucolic teaching elsewhere: ps.-Moschus, *Bion.epit.* 94–96 οὐ ξένος ᾠδᾶς / βουκολικᾶς, ἀλλ’ ἄντε διδάξαιο σείο μαθητάς / κλαρονόμος μῶσας τᾶς Δωρίδος, “no stranger I to bucolic song, but heir to that Doric Muse which you did teach your pupils”; Calp. Sic. *Buc.* 2.28 *dociles* ... *auenas*, “easily taught pipes”. Erotodidaxis is naturalized in the pastoral world of Longus’ *Daphnis and Chloe*. At 3.18 Daphnis is taught the *technē* of love (3.19 ἐρωτική παιδαγωγία) by Lycaenion. Daphnis’ simplicity is not just that of the child, but an αἰπολική ἀφέλεια, “goatherd’s innocence”. At the end of the novel the young lovers are finally put to bed, 4.40: καὶ ἔδρασέ τι Δάφνης ὧν αὐτὸν ἐπαίδευσε Λυκαῖνιον, καὶ τότε Χλόη πρῶτον ἔμαθεν ὅτι τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς ὕλης γενόμενα ἦν παιδίων παίγνια, “Daphnis performed one of Lycaenion’s lessons, and then Chloe learned that what had happened in the woods was child’s play”. The completion of Chloe’s education coincides with her emergence from the bucolic woods.

Tityrus: 1.44–45 *hic mihi responsum primus dedit ille petenti: / “pascite ut ante boues, pueri, submittite tauros”*, “here he was the first to give a response to my petition: ‘Pasture your cattle as before, boys, raise your bulls’”. The puzzling *primus*, and the curious use of the plural *pueri* in response to the singular Tityrus, are both paralleled in the Muses’ address to Hesiod at *Theog.* 24–26 (immediately after the lines to which Simichidas refers at *Theocr.* 7.92): τόνδε δέ με πρόωιστα θεαὶ πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπον, ... “ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι, κτλ., “these were the words that the goddesses first spoke to me ... ‘Shepherds of the fields, etc.’”.¹⁹

The notion of teaching occurs in a scene of poetic succession at the end of *Ecl.* 5, modelled in part on the award by the umpire at the end of *Id.* 8 of the pipe of the defeated Menalcas to Daphnis. In *Ecl.* 5 the older poet Menalcas recognises the achievement of the younger Mopsus (addressed as *puer* at ll. 19 and 49), and whom he has already praised for coming level with his “master” (l. 48) by conferring on him his own hemlock pipe (ll. 86–87): *haec nos “formosum Corydon ardebat Alexin”, / haec eadem docuit “cuium pecus? an Meliboei?”*, “this pipe taught me ‘Corydon burned for beautiful Alexis’, and the same pipe taught me ‘Whose flock? Is it Meliboeus’s?’”. The pipe is a symbol of the bucolic tradition that ‘taught’ Menalcas/Virgil *Eclogues* 2 and 3, whose first lines are here quoted. But the hemlock (*cicuta*) is also a part of the natural world that has ‘taught’ a human singer his art. Some light is shed on this enigmatic proposition by a passage in Lucretius’ account of the invention of music through the observation of natural phenomena, 5.1382–1383 *et zephyri, caua per calamorum, sibila primum / agrestis docuere cauas inflare cicutas*, “the whistling of the west wind through the hollow reeds first taught the countryfolk to blow into hollow hemlock-pipes”.²⁰

The dense allusions to poetic filiation and succession that close *Ecl.* 5 and the first half of the *Eclogues* book, before the “proem in the middle” that opens the second half, form a ring with the equally dense and allusive programmatic signals that open the first *Eclogue*. A striking use of *docere* occurs in the fifth line *formosam resonare doces Amaryllida siluas*, “you teach the woods to echo beautiful Amaryllis”. As at 5.87 the act of teaching personifies the natural world, with the difference that here

¹⁹ See Hanslik (1955) 16–17; Wright (1983) 117–118.

²⁰ Mizera (1982) 371: “in the light of Vergil’s transformation of Daphnis through the medium of Lucretian allusions, we are perhaps entitled to see Menalcas’ *cicuta* as an emblem of Lucretius’ gift to Vergil, a legacy of his tradition and poetic inspiration”.

the human singer Tityrus is the subject of the verb, and the vegetable woods are the recipient of instruction. As we saw above, *siluestrem* ... *Musam* in the first line has already activated a context of Lucretian discussions of musical noises in the countryside. In 5.5 Virgil combines allusion to the passage on the delusive animation of the landscape by echo in Lucretius' book 4 with allusion to the account in book 5 of nature's teaching of early man. As Brian Breed points out, "whereas Tityrus teaches ... the woods to echo 'Amaryllis', in Lucretius the winds teach [5.1383–1384 *docuere, didicere*] ... [E]cho reverses the relationship between a natural origin and man's imitation that first produces music on Lucretius' telling".²¹ The Lucretian echoing landscape is peopled only by insentient atoms, while the Virgilian woods have minds that can be taught, so that their echoes are signs of a real presence. Coming where it does so near the beginning of the book, the word *doces* itself might be read as a generic signal, an allusion to the *didactic* poet Lucretius (as both Brian Breed and John van Sickle suggest). Going further, one might see in the allusion a Romanization of Simichidas' location at Theocr. 7.92 of the origin of Theocritean bucolic in a repetition of the initiation of Hesiod as a didactic poet at the beginning of the *Theogony* (see above), and, within *Ecl.* 1, *doces* can be read as an anticipation of the Hesiodic allusion in the words of the *iuuenis* at l. 45.

Tityrus first appears in the role of a 'teacher', teaching the woods to echo the name of Amaryllis. At *Ecl.* 1.28 he informs us that he is no longer young and that his beard is going white. It was at this stage of life that he went to Rome, to receive the response of the *iuuenis*: *pascite ut ante boues, pueri, submittite tauros*, "pasture your cattle as before, boys, raise your bulls" (1.45). *pueri* is usually taken to mean "slaves";²² but this programmatic address by the divine young man who takes the place of the Muses in authorising Virgil's pastoral world, and whose words

²¹ Breed (2000) 14. See also van Sickle (2000) 47: "the idea of teaching woods also counters Lucretius' account of cultural origins ... The picture of a lover teaching trees creates, too, a dynamic of succession with Callimachus". Note that van Sickle's reference to Callim. fr. 73 Pfeiffer should in fact be to Aristaenet. 1.10.58–61 "trees, I wish that you had a mind and a voice, so that you could just say 'Cydlippe is beautiful'. At least may you carry carved on your bark as many letters as spell out 'beautiful Cydlippe'", possibly preserving Callimachean material: at the beginning of the *Eclogues* the woods are imagined as sentient beings capable of being taught the name of the beloved; at the end, *Ecl.* 10.52–54 (cf. Callim. *Ait.* fr. 73) trees have turned into the passive bearers of the poet's inscribed *amores*, as writing replaces voice.

²² On the uses of *puer*, *pueri* as forms of address see Dickey (2002) 191–195.

probably allude to the Hesiodic address to “shepherds”,²³ also identifies an important group of inhabitants of the pastoral world as, literally, “boys”.²⁴

Boys, *pueri*, are to be found in every eclogue save the seventh and tenth. At the end of *Ecl.* 3 the umpire Palaemon addresses the two singers as *pueri* (3.111). In *Ecl.* 5 the younger singer Mopsus is addressed as *puer* by Menalcas (ll. 19, 49). The subject of the songs of *Ecl.* 5, the archetypal pastoral ‘hero’ Daphnis, is labelled a *puer* (l. 54), as is another Daphnis at 3.14. In *Ecl.* 6 the *pueri* (ll. 14, 24) Chromis and Mnasyllus extract the song from the *senex* Silenus. At the end of *Ecl.* 9 Moeris tells Lycidas (l. 66) *desine plura, puer*, “sing no more, boy”, in context a signal that the songs of pastoral boys are drawing to a close; at *Ecl.* 9.51–52 Moeris remembers how when a boy he had the power of endless song, but now with the passage of time his memory is failing. In the previous poem, *Ecl.* 8, the suicidal lover of Damon’s song looks back to a lost age of innocence when he was a twelve-year old boy. His present song of experience records the cruelty of another *puer*, the god of love (ll. 45, 49, 50), the god whose activities will definitively close off the pastoral world in *Eclogue* 10. To complete the tally, *pueri* are objects of homosexual desire at *Ecl.* 2.17, 45; 3.70; addressed as practitioners of typical pursuits in the pastoral world at *Ecl.* 3.93, 98; and *Ecl.* 4 is wholly dedicated to the story of a *puer* (ll. 8, 18, 60, 62).

Boys and teaching come together in the central *Ecl.* 4, 5, and 6. *Ecl.* 5 we have already considered. In *Ecl.* 6 the *pueri* Chromis and Mnasyllus, inhabitants of a mythologised pastoral landscape, turn into the recipients of a Lucretian didaxis when Silenus begins his song with an extended pastiche of Lucretian cosmology. For this space of time they fill the role of the childlike audience for whom Lucretius smears the honey on his bitter philosophical cup, 1.939–940 *ut puerorum aetas improuida ludificetur / laborum tenus*, “so that thoughtless young children should have their lips tricked”, and who need Epicurean enlightenment to stop them from being afraid like children in the dark: 2.55–56 (= 3.87–88, 6.35–36) *nam ueluti pueri trepidant atque omnia caecis / in tenebris metuunt*, “for just as children are anxious and afraid of everything in the

²³ The *iuuenis* as Muse or god of poetry: Wright (1983) 14–23.

²⁴ The paradoxical combination of boy and old man may also allude to the prologue to Callimachus’ *Aitia* where the ageing poet looks back to his youthful initiation by Apollo, and who continues to write poetry *παῖς ἄτε*, although his years are many.

dark shadows". But this is an ironical setting for Lucretian teaching, for Silenus performs his song in a version of the supernaturally populated landscape that Lucretius rejects in his account of echoic delusion at 4.580–594: *Ecl.* 6.27–28 *tum uero in numerum Faunosque ferasque uideres / ludere*, "then indeed you might see Fauns and wild beasts keeping time as they sported".²⁵ After Silenus finishes, the poem ends with the Lucretian multiple echoes operating in a divinised and sentient landscape where, as at *Ecl.* 1.5, trees can be the subjects of instruction: *Ecl.* 6.82–84 *omnia, quae Phoebus quondam meditante beatus / audiit Eurotas iussitque ediscere lauros, / ille canit, pulsae referunt ad sidera ualles*, "he sung all the things that the happy river Eurotas once heard as Apollo rehearsed them, and told the laurels to learn them, and the echoing valleys repeated them to the stars".²⁶

I turn now to *Ecl.* 4. Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* provides the (child-like) reader with an education that constructs an Epicurean world system; if we successfully learn our ABC we will also have put the building blocks (*elementa*) of the universe in their proper place. *Ecl.* 4 charts the development of a *puer* which by a mysterious sympathy simultaneously reorders the world. The very unLucretian sympathy between child and cosmos is expressed in very Lucretian language at *Ecl.* 4.50–51. The content of the boy's own education is also unLucretian, a traditional upper-class Roman's study of the great men of the epic and historical past (4.26–27). The child will grow up not as a philosophical Hercules (cf. *Lucr.* 5.22–51), but as the Herakles whose education as a model for the training of kings is the subject of one of Theocritus' non-bucolic idylls, 24 (*Herakliskos*).²⁷ At the same time the choice as subject of *Ecl.* 4 of a *puer* is not just a token of adherence to a generally Alexandrian,

²⁵ With *ludere* cf. *Lucr.* 4.582 *ludoque iocanti. in numerum ludere*: cf. *Lucr.* 2.630–631 (Curetes) *inter se ... quod armis / ludunt in numerumque exsultant sanguine laeti*, "because they sport together with weapons and dance in time, exulting in blood". Martini (1986) 326–327 suggests further links between the scene of the binding of Silenus and Lucretius' statement of his poetic mission at 1.921–950 (1.926–950 = *Ecl.* 4.1–25, where the lines function as a "proem in the middle"; that might encourage us to see the binding of Silenus in *Ecl.* 6 as an extension of the proem in the middle constituted by lines 1–12).

²⁶ The notion of teaching picks up the metaphor at *Lucr.* 4.578–579 *ita colles collibus ipsi / uerba repulsantes iterabant docta referri*, "thus, reflecting words taught to return, the hills themselves repeated them to the hills" (*docta* is Lachmann's emendation); cf. also *Lucr.* 2.327–328 *clamoreque montes / icti reieciunt uoces ad sidera mundi*, "struck by the shouts the mountains hurl back the voices at the stars of heaven".

²⁷ See Clausen (1994) 122–123.

Callimachean, ‘childish poetics’ (as Llewelyn Morgan suggests),²⁸ but more specifically a continuation by other means of the tales of pastoral *pueri*.

The *Eclogues* book’s last piece of Lucretian didaxis, as we have seen, is the information about the harmful effect of the shade of the juniper. From Pliny, *NH* 17.89–91 we gather that there was a well-developed body of doctrine on the effects of the shade of various trees; it is as if we were graduating from the bucolic fantasies of the *Eclogues*, where trees can literally (in some sense) be subjects of instruction, to a more scientific botany, where trees are merely the subject-matter of instruction:²⁹ *Ecl.* 10.75–76 might form part of the classification of trees and shrubs found in *Georgics* 2. The pastoral *umbra* has turned harmful, and the lines in which this is stated themselves begin to perform the poem to which the poet must now rise.

4. *Cultural history and poetic aetiology in Ecl. 1*

I return now from the life-cycle and education of the individual to larger histories. Recent studies of the opening of *Ecl.* 1 have made increasingly clear the complex set of allusions by which Virgil articulates the genealogy of his *Bucolica*. Beyond the simple delineation of his own literary succession, Virgil also alludes to passages in earlier texts that explicitly or implicitly construct a cultural or literary aetiology, or ‘foundation myth’, of bucolic poetry. The poem’s opening image of Tityrus reclining under a tree and making music alludes not just to the opening of Theocritus 1, but also to the anticipation in the song of Lycidas in Theocritus’ *Id.* 7 of a song by Tityrus about the mythical singer Comatas, who is imagined making music as he reclines under oaks or pines (7.88–89). As Richard Hunter makes clear in his commentary, this passage is a “foundation myth” for “aipolic song”.³⁰

But Lucretian, as well as Theocritean, stories about origins are contained within Virgil’s opening lines. The phrase *silvestris musa*, as we have seen, is taken from a passage in which Lucretius speaks of ori-

²⁸ Morgan (1992) 79 “the Child ... is a symbol of the artistic principles which underlie [*Ecl.* 4]”.

²⁹ But note that the idea of teaching the natural world returns in the *Georgics*, in the recurrent image of the farmer’s cultivation as a kind of instruction or training of the crops: see Hardie (2004).

³⁰ See in particular van Sickle (2000) 23–28.

gins of a sensory-psychological kind: the phenomenon of echo is the source of a deluded belief in a supernatural pastoral music-making, in which the pipes are played by Pan, the mythical inventor of the instrument (4.572–594).³¹ We have also seen how the reference to pastoral echo in the fifth line of *Ecl.* 1 “reverses the relationship between a natural origin and man’s imitation that first produces music on Lucretius’ telling.”³²

If we pair *Ecl.* 1.2 *siluestrem tenui Musam meditaris auena*, “you practise the woodland Muse on a slender oat”, with the reprise at 6.8, *agrestem tenui meditabor harundine Musam*, “I will practise the rustic Muse on a slender reed”, we are referred to Lucretius’ account of the historical origins of (pastoral) music at 5.1379–1407, which contains the phrase *agrestis Musa* at l. 1398 *agrestis enim tum musa uigebat*, “for the rustic Muse flourished at that time”. Tityrus at the beginning of *Ecl.* 1, reclining under a tree (cf. *Lucr.* 5.1393 *sub ramis arboris altae*) is then retrojected into an idyllic past near the beginning of Lucretius’ history of human civilisation.³³ As William Berg says, “the situation of Lucretius’ original singers has been reproduced in the world of Tityrus”.³⁴ Poetic and cultural genealogies are tightly bonded with the glue of Lucretian allusion.

³¹ See Breed (2000) 11–13.

³² Breed (2000) 14. See also van Sickle (2000) 47: “the idea of teaching woods also counters Lucretius’ account of cultural origins ... The picture of a lover teaching trees creates, too, a dynamic of succession with Callimachus”.

³³ The fourfold *nunc* at *Ecl.* 3.56–57 marks the plenitude of spring as Damoetas and Menalcas sit down to their song contest; the anaphora also alludes to the springtime setting for the first beginnings of music at *Lucr.* 5.1395–1398 *praesertim cum tempestas ridebat et anni / tempora pingebant uiridantis floribus herbas. / tum ioca, tum sermo, tum dulces esse cachinni / consuerant. agrestis enim tum musa uigebat*, “above all when the weather smiles and the season paints the green grass with flowers. Then is the time for jesting, then for conversation, then for sweet laughter; for then the rustic muse flourished”. *tum* refers in the first place to the time of year (spring), not to a period in history, but the imperfects also consign this springtime activity to a historical past, whose separation from the present day is marked at 5.1423–1424 *tunc igitur pelles, nunc aurum et purpura curis / exercent hominum uitam belloque fatigant*, “then it was animal skins, now it is gold and purple that wear out men’s lives with care and exhaust them in war”. Lucretian archaeological reconstruction becomes the immediate poetic ‘now’ of Virgil’s pastoral singers. Once again Lucretian cultural history is overlaid on Greek bucolic models: with the Virgilian anaphora cf. ps.-Theocr. 9.7–8 ἄδῃ μὲν ... ἄδῃ δέ (see Wills (1996) 358), and Bion fr. 2.17 εἴασι ... εἴαρος (Heyne, reported by Clausen). For the ‘springtime of the world’ cf. *G.* 2.338–339, modelled on *Lucr.* 5.780–820.

³⁴ Berg (1974) 104.

5. *Histories of the world*

Virgilian bucolic invests not just in poetic and cultural genealogies, but in social and political histories on the grandest scale. Here too Lucretian allusion is determinative. If Meliboeus' words at the beginning of *Ecl.* 1 project Tityrus back into a time near the beginning of history, Tityrus' reply reveals that he is also very much the man of the modern world, in terms both of the history of Rome in the late 40s BC, and of Lucretian allusion. While l. 6 *haec otia*, "this peaceful state" reproduces the condition of Lucretius' primitive rustics—Lucr. 5.1389 *per loca pastorum deserta atque otia dia*, "in the deserted places and divine peaceableness of shepherds" is the only instance of *otium* in Lucretius—, this *otium* is not the result of an original state of innocence, but a peace restored after the catastrophes of war (just as Lucretius' present-day Epicurean through his philosophical exertions will win through to a state approximating to the simple rustic pleasures of primitive man).³⁵

The 'divine' merits of the young man in Rome who has created this *otium* are praised in language that alludes heavily to Lucretius' praise of Epicurus: with *Ecl.* 1.6–7 *O Meliboe, deus nobis haec otia fecit. / namque erit ille mihi semper deus, eqs.*, "O Meliboeus, a god created this state of peace for us; for that man will always be a god to me, etc.", compare Lucretius 5.7–12:

*nam si, ut ipsa petit maiestas cognita rerum,
dicendum est, deus ille fuit, deus, inclute Memmi,
qui princeps uitae rationem inuenit eam quae
nunc appellatur sapientia, quique per artem
fluctibus e tantis uitam tantisque tenebris
in tam tranquillo et tam clara luce locauit.*³⁶

For, famous Memmius, if I am to speak as the acknowledged dignity of the subject requires, that man was a god, a god, who first discovered that way of life which is now called wisdom, and who through his skill rescued human life from such great storms and darkness, to place it in such calm and in so bright a light.

Here at the beginning of book 5 Lucretius praises the philosopher whose 'divine' discoveries and benefactions mark the summit of human achievement, the culmination of the history that will be traced at length

³⁵ See n. 3 on *recubans*, describing both Tityrus' ideal *otium*, and Mars reclining in the lap of the Lucretian Venus, an image of the desired peace in the Roman world that is also a mythological picture of the calm pleasure enjoyed by the Epicurean.

³⁶ Noted by van Sickle (2000) 52, ref. to Farrington and Wright.

in the last part of book 5, to be capped by repetition, at the beginning of book 6, of the praise of the *diuina reperta*, “divine discoveries” (6.7), of Epicurus. A comparable circle is joined between the beginning of *Ecl.* 1 and *Ecl.* 5, the poem that marks a provisional closure halfway through the *Eclogues* book, and also a poem that is replete with Lucretian allusion.³⁷ The Lucretian god-man is now not the living *iuuenis*, but the dead and deified Daphnis. Like Epicurus he has died (*Ecl.* 5.20 *extinctum*: cf. *Lucr.* 6.7 *extincti*), and, like Epicurus, he now enjoys an Odyssean sky-reaching fame: *Ecl.* 5.43 *hinc usque ad sidera notus*, “known from here right up to the stars”; 52 *Daphnin ad astra feremus*, “we will raise Daphnis to the stars”: cf. *Lucr.* 6.7–8 *propter diuina reperta / diuulgata uetus iam ad caelum gloria fertur*, “because of the publication of his divine discoveries his glory has long past been carried to the skies”. But, unlike Epicurus, Daphnis has literally been translated to the place of the gods: *ipsae iam carmina rupes, / ipsa sonant arbusta* “*deus, deus ille, Menalca!*”, “the very rocks and trees now sound out in song: ‘A god, a god is he, Menalcas!’”, *Ecl.* 5.63–64. At the beginning of *Ecl.* 1 it was the human Tityrus who mouthed a Lucretian gemination of *deus* (ll. 6–7); here it is the echoing rocks and trees, now advanced learners in a pastoral didaxis in which they were first taught how to babble trivialities such as “*Amaryllis*”.³⁸ Daphnis, like Tityrus, is a lover of *otium*: l. 61 *amat bonus otia Daphnis*. The Julian allegory barely concealed in the figure of Daphnis shows Virgil already adapting the structures of Lucretian cultural history to what will become the ideology of the *pax Augusta*.

It is in the three central *Eclogues* 4, 5 and 6 that Virgil widens the pastoral lens to take in the most capacious views of historical process. In all three poems the breadth of view reveals the enabling power of a Lucretian vision, but in all three Virgil swerves from the truths of Epicurean doctrine. The heresies of *Ecl.* 5 we have already looked at; *Ecl.* 4 receives fuller treatment below.

In *Ecl.* 6 Silenus’ universal song, which reaches, to adapt Ovid, *prima ab origine mundi ad Vergilii tempora*, starts out in grandiose Lucretian manner (ll. 31–40), but we have already been told that the song is performed in a version of the supernaturally populated landscape that Lucretius rejects in his account of echoic delusion, a landscape where trees as well as boys can go to school (see above). The Song of Silenus itself

³⁷ See especially Mizera (1982).

³⁸ On the gemination of *deus* see Wills (1996) 61–62. Is there any significance in the fact that *Lucr.* 6 and *Ecl.* 6 both begin *prima(e)*, with reference to a famous Greek city?

is a comprehensive survey of cosmic and human history, that begins in an obtrusively Lucretian mode, but then seems to veer in an anti-Lucretian direction with the catalogue of stories of metamorphosis and disastrous love from l. 41. Yet even here there may be a Lucretian trace, for Silenus' narrative combines histories of progress and progressive unhappiness, in a manner broadly comparable to the complex mix of primitivism and progressivism in the Lucretian history of civilization.³⁹ Gallus as climax of human history is a very different culture-hero from Epicurus; presiding over his poetic initiation is Linus, a legendary poet with a sad history and a bitter garland, *Ecl.* 6.68 *floribus atque apio crinis ornatus amaro*, "his hair adorned with flowers and bitter celery", leaving a different taste from the picture of the primitive practitioners of the *agrestis Musa* at *Lucr.* 5.1399–1400 *tum caput atque umeros plexis redimire coronis / floribus et foliis lasciua laeta monebat*, "then their happy playfulness gave them the idea of binding head and shoulders with garlands woven of flowers and leaves". Will the bitter celery give the singer a headache?⁴⁰

Lucretian cosmic history is also exploited to articulate the internal structure of the *Eclogues* book at the hinge between poems 5 and 6. The fifth poem's provisional closure, at the end of the first half of the book, is signalled intratextually by Menalcas' gift to Mopsus at the end of the poem of the pipes that "taught" him the second and third *Eclogues* (5.85–87), but before that intertextually, in the reworking in the resurrected culture hero Daphnis of the Lucretian version of the end of history with the coming of a philosophical saviour to reveal his "theory of everything". The second half of the book similarly has two beginnings: Virgil's song opens with another scene of poetic initiation in the Callimachean "proemio al mezzo", while Silenus' song opens with the grander beginning of cosmogony, in lines that contain the densest concentration of verbal allusion to Lucretius anywhere in the *Eclogues*,⁴¹ starting even before the introduction of the void with the conjunction *uti* (31), the archaic form "frequent in Lucretius, [but] not found elsewhere in the *Eclogues*".⁴²

³⁹ So Castelli (1967) 188.

⁴⁰ *amarus*, not elsewhere applied to celery (Clausen *ad* 6.68) looks like a pointed revision of the "sweetsmelling celery" woven into a garland at Theocr. 3.23 (see Hunter *ad loc.*).

⁴¹ On Lucretian elements in *Ecl.* 6 see Farrell (1991a) 301–307.

⁴² Clausen *ad loc.* (*uti*: twice in *G.*, four times in *Aen.*).

6. *Ecl. 4 and Lucretian world-views*

The fourth *Eclogue's* sense of time is generally seen within the two frames of, firstly, a religious tradition of apocalyptic history, exemplified in the *Sibylline Oracles*, and, secondly, the Hesiodic races of mankind as filtered through Catullus 64. Lucretius is a no less important presence. One aspect of this presence is perceptively sketched out by Richard Jenkyns (1998). Despite his misguided assertion of the marginality of Lucretius in the *Eclogues*,⁴³ Jenkyns notes firstly that “[the *Aeneid's*] sense of time, history and process ... are to be found already in an unlikely place, the fourth *Eclogue*”.⁴⁴ He then comments on the poem’s “concern for process”,⁴⁵ expressed through inceptive verbs and the adverb *paulatim*, and makes the Lucretian connection thus: “in Virgil the sense of process will be more fully explored; but when he first takes up the theme, in the fourth *Eclogue*, we find him learning from Lucretius and using the elements that we see here: the word ‘paulatim’ in association with inceptive verbs”.⁴⁶

It is no surprise, then, to find *Ecl. 4* drawing on Lucretian accounts of the history of the world. There is a well known echo right at the beginning of the fourth *Eclogue's* narrative: 4.7 *iam noua progenies caelo demittitur alto*, “now a new race is sent down from the lofty sky”; cf. Lucr. 2.1153–1154 *haud, ut opinor, enim mortalia saecula superne / aurea de caelo demisit funis in arua*, “for, in my view, it was no golden rope that let the races of mortal creatures down to the fields from the heavens above”. Rather, by a typical ‘correction’ of mythological convention, for Lucretius all living things are the children of a Mother Earth, whose generative powers have so declined that we live in “a broken and exhausted age” (2.1150 *fracta ... aetas effetaque tellus*), a senescence reversed in the Virgilian new age, introduced by the *noua progenies*. The passage as a whole (2.1144–1174), which is an important source for Virgil’s vision of an unforgiving nature in the *Georgics*,⁴⁷ finds recurrent echoes by inversion in *Ecl. 4*.⁴⁸

⁴³ Jenkyns (1998) 211: “Lucretius was known to Virgil when he wrote the *Eclogues*, but does not yet seem to affect him in more than a superficial way”.

⁴⁴ Jenkyns (1998) 199.

⁴⁵ Jenkyns (1998) 202.

⁴⁶ Jenkyns (1998) 242, with ref. to Lucr. 1.188–191; cf. also *ibid.* 205 n. 196 “Virgil’s manner of describing gradual process surely owes something also to the end of Lucretius’ fifth book (especially 5.1452ff.)”. On the use of Lucretian cultural history in *Ecl. 4* see also Martini (1986) 314–317.

⁴⁷ Gale (2000) 64–65.

⁴⁸ Lucr. 2.1146 *integrare nouando*, “to make whole by renewing”, cf. *Ecl. 4.5 ab integro*, 7

Related to the passage at the end of the second book of *De Rerum Natura* is 5.821–836, on the contemporary exhaustion of “mother” Earth, who in the past (5.822–824) *genus ipsa creauit / humanum atque animal prope certo tempore fudit / omne quod in magnis bacchatur montibu’ passim*, “herself gave birth to the human race and almost at a fixed time brought forth every animal that runs wild all over the great mountains”. In *Ecl.* 4 the earth recovers her primitive profusion: ll. 19–20 *errantis heredas passim cum baccare tellus / mixtaque ridenti colocasia fundet acantho*, “the earth will bring forth everywhere ivy wandering with baccar, and the Indian lotus mingled with the laughing acanthus”.⁴⁹ Lucretius goes on to generalise about the successive ages of the earth, 5.834–836:

*sic igitur mundi naturam totius aetas
mutat et ex alio terram status excipit alter,
quod tulit ut nequeat, possit quod non tulit ante.*

Thus old age changes the nature of the whole world, and one state of the earth is replaced by another, so that it can no longer bear what it once did, and is able to bear that which it did not before.

In the world of *Ecl.* 4 this limitation is transcended: l. 39 *omnis feret omnia tellus*, “every land will bear all things”. The verbal detail here is closer to *Lucr.* 1.166 *ferre omnes omnia possent*, “all trees could bear all

noua progenies. Lucretius applies Golden Age imagery to the condition of the earth in the remote past, 1.157–1.159 *praeterea nitidas fruges uinetaque laeta / sponte sua primum mortalibus ipsa creauit, / ipsa dedit dulcis fetus et pabula laeta*, “moreover she herself spontaneously first created for mortals the bright crops and fertile vineyards, she herself gave sweet fruits and rich pasture”; *Lucr.* 2.1167 (*grandis arator*) *laudat fortunas saepe parentis*, “the aged ploughman often praises the fortunes of his father”, cf. *Ecl.* 4.26–27 *et simul heroum laudes et facta parentis / iam legere ... poteris*, “and as soon as you are able to read of the famous exploits of heroes and your father’s deeds”; *Lucr.* 2.1151–1152 *uix animalia parua creat quae cuncta creauit / saecula deditque ferarum ingentia corpora partu*, “the earth barely brings forth small creatures, she who brought forth all breeds and who gave birth to the huge bodies of wild animals”: cf. the child of *Ecl.* 4, who is called (l. 49) *magnum Iouis incrementum*, “a mighty addition to Jupiter”, and is the subject of a song in which the poet himself is able to expand his scale (l. 1 *paulo maiora*). That phrase itself occurs at *Lucr.* 2.137, perhaps coincidentally the only other example of *paulo maior* in the neuter plural recorded at *TLL* X.1, 832.9.

⁴⁹ Coleman *ad loc.* suggests that the unidentified plant *baccar* “may well have been given a false etymology from *Bacchus*”; *bacchatur* in the Lucretian passage might indeed trigger the association. The Lucretian passage may also lie behind *Ecl.* 6.40 *rara per ignaros errent animalia montis*, “isolated [not yet *passim*] animals wander over the unknown mountains”, where *errent* may be set beside *Ecl.* 4.19 *errantis*. Cf. also *Lucr.* 5.917 (in the beginning) *tempore quo primum tellus animalia fudit*, “the time when the earth first brought forth animals”.

fruits [if things could come from nothing]”,⁵⁰ but the context in *Ecl.* 4, of changing ages of the world, is shared with the passage in Lucretius’ book 5.

Rather less expected is Virgil’s exploitation, in his prophecy of the unfolding new age, of a passage in which Lucretius speaks not about historical process, but of a fixed and inalterable state of affairs, the differences in human character that result from differing mixtures of the elements of fire, wind, and air in the soul (3.282–322). Lucretius tells us (i) that these elemental traits *cannot* be totally eradicated from the soul, any more than a lion can cease to be irascible, a deer fearful, or a cow placid; but (ii) that these traces are so small as not to prevent our leading a life worthy of the gods:

(i) Ineradicability of elemental traces:

*quamuis doctrina politos
constituat pariter quosdam, tamen illa relinquit
naturae cuiusque animi uestigia prima.
nec radicitus euelli mala posse putandumst,
quin procliuius hic iras decurrat ad acris,
ille metu citius paulo temptetur, at ille
tertius accipiat quaedam clementius aequo.* (Lucr. 3.307–313)

However much education may bring some men to an equal state of refinement, nevertheless it leaves fundamental traces of the nature of each soul. You should not think that faults can be so totally eradicated that one man is not more prone to run into bitter anger, another is a little more quickly assailed by fear, while a third responds to some things more meekly than is proper.

(ii) Possibility of becoming godlike:

*illud in his rebus uideo firmare potesse,
usque adeo naturarum uestigia linqui
paruula quae nequeat ratio depellere nobis,
ut nil impediatur dignam dis degere uitam.* (Lucr. 3.319–322)

In this connection I note that I can affirm that the traces of our natures which reason is unable to drive out are so small that there is nothing to prevent us leading a life worthy of the gods.

Virgil in *Ecl.* 4 tells of the maturation of a *Wunderkind* into a life “worthy of the gods”, but, unlike Lucretius, Virgil has in mind the literally

⁵⁰ Cf. *G.* 2.109 *nec uero terrae ferre omnes omnia possent*, “nor in truth could all lands bear all things”. On Virgil’s inversion of Lucretian ideas about limits and gradual change at the beginning of the second book of *Georgics* see Gale (2000) chap. 6.

physical copresence of man and god. Further this is accompanied by radical, and unLucretian, innovation in, or renovation of, the laws of nature. Not only does Virgil invert Lucretius' own accounts of temporal process, he also proclaims the possibility of miraculous change where Lucretius insists on immutability.

The child's accession to the life of the gods is foreseen at beginning and end of *Ecl.* 4: ll. 15–16 *ille deum uitam accipiet diuisque uidebit / permixtos heroas et ipse uidebitur ipsis*, “he will be admitted to the life of the gods, and will see the heroes mingling with the gods, and he himself will be seen by them”; 63 *nec deus hunc mensa, dea nec dignata cubili est*, “[unless the child smiles on his mother] a god will not consider him worthy of his table, nor a goddess of her bed”. Virgil combines Lucretian allusion with allusion to Catullus 64.407–408 *quare nec talis dignantur uisere coetus, / nec se contingi patiuntur lumine claro*, “[in the present corrupt age, the gods] therefore do not see fit to visit such human societies, nor do they allow themselves to be met in broad daylight”, in contrast to the day of the first voyage of the Argo, when mortal eyes gazed on naked sea nymphs (64.16–18), and in contrast to the occasion of the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, in a time when gods still came to the houses of mortal heroes (64.384–386).⁵¹

Lucretius speaks of natural *uestigia*, “traces” (a favourite word of his) that cannot be eradicated, using the word twice in this passage (ll. 309, 320). *Ecl.* 4 twice refers to *uestigia* of sinfulness that *will* disappear as the world returns to the Golden Age: 4.13–14 *te duce, si*

⁵¹ This combination of Catullan with Lucretian allusion becomes something of a trick in *Ecl.* 4. Line 62 *qui non risere parenti*, “those who have not laughed in the presence of their mother” is a well-known allusion to Catullus 61.209–212 *Torquatus uolo paruulus ... dulce rideat ad patrem*, “I wish that a little Torquatus should laugh sweetly before his father”; but the formulation two lines before, 60 *incipere, parue puer, risu cognoscere matrem*, “little boy, start to recognise your mother with a laugh”, contains a Lucretian line-ending, 2.349–350 *nec ratione alia proles cognoscere matrem / nec mater posset prolem*, “by no other means could a child recognise its mother, or a mother her child”. *Ecl.* 4.40–41 *non rastros patietur humus, non uinea falcem; / robustus quoque iam tauris iuga soluet arator*, “the earth will not suffer the hoe, nor the vine the pruning-hook; the sturdy ploughman will also now unyoke his bulls” draws both on Lucr. 5.933–936 *nec robustus erat curui moderator aratri / quisquam, nec scibat ... altis / arboribus ueteres decidere falcibus ramos* “[during *nouitas mundi*, the infancy of the world] nor was there any sturdy wielder of the curved plough, nor anyone who knew how to ... cut back old branches from lofty trees with pruning hooks”, and Cat. 64.39–41 *non humilis curuis purgatur uinea rastris, / non glebam prono conuellit uomere taurus, / non falx attenuat frondatorum arboris umbram*, “the low vines were not weeded with curved hoes, the bull did not plough up the earth with the sloping share, the pruners’ hook did not thin the shade of the tree”.

qua manent sceleris uestigia nostri, / inrita perpetua soluent formidine terras, “under your leadership, whatever traces of our sinfulness remain will be erased, freeing the earth from everlasting dread”; 4.31 *pauca tamen suberunt priscae uestigia fraudis*, “but there will remain a few traces of the former guilt”, which will be eradicated once the child has grown into a man.⁵²

Virgil’s *Ecl.* 4 describes a world made radically new, in which lions will no longer have fiery hearts, to judge from ll. 22 *nec magnos metuent armenta leones*, “nor will the herds fear great lions”, a world in which fear shall be absolutely no more: l. 14 [*uestigia*] *inrita perpetua soluent formidine terras*, quoted above. But in the Lucretian world the *formido* that resides in a soul in which wind predominates can never be shaken off entirely (3.290 *est et frigida multa comes formidinis aura*, “there is (in the soul) an abundance of cold breeze, the companion of fear”; 3.312 *ille metu citius paulo temptetur*, “another man is a little more quickly assailed by fear”).

Ecl. 4 eradicates the anger of the lion and the fearfulness of the deer. We are left with the third way of the cow, placed between the lion (whose angry soul contains an excess of fire) and the deer (whose timid soul contains an excess of cold wind): Lucr. 3.292–293 *est etiam quoque pacati status aeris ille, / pectore tranquillo qui fit uultuque sereno*, “then there is also the condition of calm air, which comes about when the heart is peaceful and the face is serene”. I would hesitate even to suggest an allusion to this bovine *ataraxia* in Virgil’s prophecy of a world pacified in the traditional Roman way at *Ecl.* 4.17 *pacatumque reget patriis uirtutibus orbem*, “he will rule over a world pacified by his father’s virtues”, were it not for the close verbal similarity between the Lucretian description of the bovine soul and a formulation of the blessed state of the gods (whither the child of *Ecl.* 4 is headed) at Lucr. 2.1093–1094 *nam pro sancta deum tranquilla pectora pace / quae placidum degunt aeuum uitamque serenam*, *eqs.*, “for by the holy hearts of the gods, who in their calm peace pass their days in tranquillity, a life of serenity, etc.”. And in the major statement of the blessed condition of the gods at Lucr. 2.646–651 we are told that the gods are free from pain and danger (hence free

⁵² This is another example of combined Catullan and Lucretian allusion, for (as noted by Jenkyns (1998) 205) Virgil also alludes to Catullus 64.295 *extenuata gerens ueteris uestigia poenae*, “[Prometheus] bearing the faded traces of his ancient punishment”. The Catullan line is also imitated at *Aen.* 4.23 *agnosco ueteris uestigia flammae*, “I recognise the traces of the ancient flame”: Dido has not succeeded in eradicating the fieriness of love from her soul.

from fear), and that they are not affected by anger—free that is from the perturbations of both deer and lions. As Xenophanes said, if cows had hands ...⁵³

7. *The shock of the new. Lucretian, Virgilian, and Ovidian novelties*

Perhaps that is an image we should not allow to take root in our mind's eye. I will end with an image of another strange kind of animal that some readers wish were not in the text of *Ecl.* 4, the sheep with red and yellow fleeces (ll. 43–45), and consider it in the light of Lucretian and Virgilian takes on novelty.⁵⁴

In the previous poem, *Ecl.* 3.86, we are told that Pollio himself composes *noua carmina*. In the next amoebean snatch the wish is expressed that he who loves Pollio should also “arrive at the fullness of a pastoral musician's art”, as Coleman paraphrases l. 88, and that such a one should be rewarded with streams of honey and with cardamum-bearing brambles (l. 89), in a kind of Golden Age of poetry.⁵⁵ Pollio will be the suitable recipient of a most unusual (*nouus* in the sense of “strange”) poem, *Ecl.* 4, which tells the story of a *noua progenies* and of the complete making new of the world in a new Golden Age. This is a return to the *nouitas mundi* (Lucr. 5.780, 818, 943), the freshness at the beginning of the world that is so vividly depicted by Lucretius; but Virgil's is also a novelty that innovates on Lucretius because it breaks through the deeply-fixed laws that govern the Lucretian universe. Lucretius encourages what might be called the jaded view; we no longer experience, and should no longer experience, that wonder at

⁵³ ... they would make gods in the likeness of themselves (Xenophanes, *VS* 21B15). Note also that Lucretius exemplifies the ability of mother and child to recognize each other (2.349 *cognoscere matrem* = *Ecl.* 4.60: see n. 51) with the pathetic vignette of a cow searching for her sacrificed calf, 2.352–366. The idea of bovine tranquillity may be linked to the image of the peaceful condition of the cities of Italy (*Aen.* 7.46 *longa placidas in pace*, “tranquil in longlasting peace”), disrupted by the war in Latium in the second half of the *Aeneid*, if we consider (i) Turnus' shield-device of Io metamorphosed into cow (7.789–790), and subsequently to be driven wild with the gadfly by Juno, who in this book has driven Turnus wild with the aid of Allecto; and (ii) the common etymology of Italia a *uitulis*, ‘the land of the cattle’: on Virgil's use of the bovine associations of Italy see Morgan (1999) 130–134.

⁵⁴ Cf. Fabre-Serris (2003) on Ovid's allusion to the Lucretian novelty of the first music (Lucr. 5.1403–1404) in his emphasis on the alluring novelty of the new panpipes at *Met.* 1.678, 709.

⁵⁵ With l. 89 cf. Theocr. 5.124–127; 1.132–133.

the sight of the heavens which must have struck the first man to look up to the stars, Lucr. 2.1030–1039: ll. 1038–1039 *quam tibi iam nemo, fessus satiate uidendi, / suspicere in caeli dignatur lucida templa!*, “just think how nobody these days, weary and sick of seeing, thinks it worthwhile to look up at the bright spaces of the sky”.⁵⁶ Virgil memorably conjures up the “stupore fanciullesco”⁵⁷ of that first seeing in the cosmogony of the Song of Silenus at *Ecl.* 6.37 *iamque nouum terrae stupeant lucescere solem*, “and now the earth is amazed at the light of the new sun”. But this novelty survives, or is rather recreated, in the miraculous remakings of Virgil’s new world. In *Ecl.* 5 the resurrected Daphnis marvels at the sight of the threshold of Olympus and this wonder is reinforced by the sight of the clouds and stars beneath his feet (*Ecl.* 5.56–57), a defamiliarization of the all-too-familiar sight of the heavens *above* our heads (cf. Lucr. 2.1039 *susplicere*, “look up at”).⁵⁸

At 5.907–912 Lucretius scoffs at the idle love of novelty that leads people to imagine the existence of impossible hybrid monsters at the beginning of the world:

*quare etiam tellure noua caeloque recenti
talìa qui fingit potuisse animalia gigni,
nixus in hoc uno nouitatis nomine inani,
multa licet simili ratione effutiat ore,
aurea tum dicat per terras flumina uulgo
fluxisse et gemmis florere arbusta suesse, eqs.*

and so he who pretends that such animals could have been born even when the earth was young and the sky new, relying only on this idle name of novelty, might with equal reason babble on about many things, saying that at that time rivers of gold commonly flowed over the earth, and that trees used to blossom with jewels, etc.

In these images Monica Gale wants to see a “sarcastic exaggeration of the tradition” of the Golden Age,⁵⁹ reduced to self-evident absurdities provoked by the itch for the new. Ovid could not resist scratching the itch, and delights in drawing our attention to his paradoxical novelties: he uses the ‘empty word’ *nouitas* both of the hybrid Minotaur, *Met.* 8.155–156 *foedumque patebat / matris adulterium monstri nouitate biformis*, “the

⁵⁶ Gale (2000) 196–201 (“*Ratio* and *miratio*”).

⁵⁷ The felicitous phrase of Martini (1986) 326.

⁵⁸ Daphnis’ revelation is also a reworking of the vision of the gods and the universe effected by the reason of Epicurus at Lucr. 3.18–30 (see Martini (1986) 310–312).

⁵⁹ Gale (1994) 162–164. With *uulgo* at Lucr. 5.911, cf. *Ecl.* 4.25 *Assyrium uulgo nascetur amomum* (*uulgo* only here in *Ecl.*; fifteen times in Lucretius).

shame of his mother's adultery was revealed by the novelty of the hybrid monster", and of the stream of gold that surprises Midas at *Met.* 11.126–127 *fusile per rictus aurum fluitare uideres. / attonitus nouitate mali, eqs.*, "you could see molten gold flow through his mouth. Astounded by the novelty of his misfortune, etc.". Novelty is of course the name of Ovid's game in the *Metamorphoses*; one of the daughters of Minyas, those most neoteric of the poem's internal narrators, chooses a tale with which, (4.284) *dulcique animos nouitate tenebo*, "I will captivate your minds with the charm of novelty".⁶⁰

There are those who wince at Ovidian readings of the *Aeneid*; let me try to shock with an Ovidian reading of *Ecl.* 4, and suggest that the lines forming the climax of the new Golden Age, the sheep with spontaneously red and yellow fleeces, are a deliberately provocative exercise in taking *nouitas* to—and beyond?—the limit. Virgil outrageously asserts his claim to be a *nouus poeta* for a new age.⁶¹

⁶⁰ Cf. also *Met.* 2.31 *rerum nouitate pauentem*, Phaethon in the Palace of the Sun, a most unusual view of the heavenly body; 12.175 *monstri nouitate*, of the bisexual Caeneus/-is, whose name means 'new'; 15.408 *mirae nouitatis* of bisexual hyena. (*nouitas* occurs fifteen times in Lucretius; seventeen times in Ovid (nine times in *Met.*)).

⁶¹ For comments on and criticism of earlier drafts of this essay I am indebted to audiences in Leeds, Thessaloniki, and Emory; and to Monica Gale, Richard Hunter, and the two editors of the *Companion*.

PANEGYRIC IN VIRGIL'S *BUCOLICS*

RUURD R. NAUTA

Panegyric is not a very popular topic in the study of pastoral: sometimes it is roundly condemned as being alien to the spirit of 'true' pastoral, more often it is just ignored or treated as a marginal phenomenon.¹ But I do not intend to argue that panegyric is, after all, compatible with, or even intrinsic to, pastoral. I will not discuss the question 'what is pastoral?', nor the question 'what is panegyric?',² but I will only add some detail to the observation that there is, in fact, panegyric in pastoral. This holds true especially for the Latin tradition; in the Greek tradition panegyric is virtually absent, even though Theocritus' poems on herdsmen are connected in significant ways to his more overtly encomiastic compositions and to the political discourses of the world in which he wrote.³ But in Virgil's *Bucolics* (as the *Eclogues* are more properly called) almost all eclogues contain some kind of panegyric (or at least some kind of discussion of panegyric), and in Calpurnius Siculus panegyric determines the character of the first, middle and last eclogues of the book. At some moments in the Middle Ages, and then in the Renaissance after the rediscovery of Calpurnius around 1360, Virgil was read 'through' Calpurnius (as well as 'through' the ancient commentators), and this determined the way panegyric was henceforth incorporated into pastoral. Accordingly, a survey of panegyric in pastoral would need to comprise at least three chapters: on Vir-

¹ Rosenmeyer (1969) 123–125 is strongly negative, Alpers (1996) is silent. Patterson (1987) deals with pastoral and ideology, but not in terms of praise. There is of necessity more attention to panegyric in studies of pastoral that include Calpurnius Siculus, such as Hubbard (1998) and Effe and Binder (2001).

² On "what is pastoral?" cf. Alpers (1996), with the review by Schmidt (1998a). For some reflections on panegyric (which I hope to develop in the near future) see Nauta (2002) 412–421.

³ See the contribution of Stephens to this volume. The most explicit panegyric moment in the poems on herdsmen comes at 7.93, where "Zeus" suggests Ptolemy Philadelphos; see Hunter (1999) *ad loc.* (and cf. also id. *ad Id.* 3.50b–1 and 4.31). On panegyric in Theocritus' other poems see Griffiths (1979a), Hunter (2003a), Stephens (2003) 122–170.

gil, on Calpurnius Siculus, and on the later tradition. But the present contribution has space for one chapter only, and this must be the first, on Virgil.⁴

1. *Aelius Donatus and Servius on praise in Virgil's Bucolics*

The ancient commentators on Virgil were less reluctant than their modern counterparts to see panegyric as a central component of his *Bucolics*. The most famous of these commentators is Aelius Donatus, whose commentary is lost, but whose life of Virgil is preserved, together with his introduction to the *Bucolics*.⁵ In the introduction Donatus discusses among other points the *intentio* of the work, which, he says, consisted in *imitatione Theocriti poetae ... et ... etiam in laude Caesaris et principum ceterorum per quos in sedes suas atque agros rediit*, “in the imitation of the poet Theocritus ... and ... also in the praise of Caesar [i.e. Octavian, the later Augustus] and the other leaders through whom he [i.e. Virgil] returned to his home and his lands” (64 Diehl). In the biography he states that the poet composed the *Bucolics maxime ut Asinium Pollionem, Alfenum Varum et Cornelium Gallum celebraret, quia in distributione agrorum ... indemnem se praestitissent*, “most of all in order to celebrate Asinius Pollio, Alfenus Varus and Cornelius Gallus, who in the land-distributions ... had saved him from loss” (19). This passage, which almost certainly goes back to Suetonius,⁶ shows some differences from Donatus’ own account (no mention of *Caesar*; the land is not regained but kept), but concords in affirming that the poet had laudatory intentions. Such intentions were more easily assumed in antiquity than nowadays, and Donatus’ formulation of Virgil’s *intentio* in writing the *Bucolics* recurs in similar form in the account of the poet’s *intentio* in writing the *Aeneid* given by Servius (whose commentary, preserved in its entirety, is dependent on the lost work of Donatus): *Homerum imitari et Augustum laudare*

⁴ For some remarks on panegyric in Calpurnius Siculus see the contribution of Mayer to this volume.

⁵ On Aelius Donatus’ commentary on Virgil see P.L. Schmidt in Herzog and Schmidt (1989) 148–154. For surveys of the biography and its possible sources see Naumann and Brugnoli (1990), Horsfall (1995). There is a new critical edition of the biography and the introduction to the *Bucolics* by Stok in Brugnoli and Stok (1997).

⁶ According to the survey in Naumann and Brugnoli (1990) 576, no scholar has denied Suetonian provenance. However, Bayer (2002) 191–196 articulates some residual doubts.

a parentibus, "to imitate Homer and praise Augustus through his ancestors" (p. 4.10–11 Th.).⁷ But in the case of the *Bucolics*, a specific reason is given for discovering praise, and that reason is an alleged connection with distributions of land.

Donatus gives a fuller version of the story earlier in his introduction, as follows (61–63).⁸ After the battle of Philippi against the murderers of Julius Caesar, Octavian (whom Donatus by anticipation calls "Augustus") confiscated land from towns which had sided with his adversaries, in order to settle his veterans. One of the towns concerned was Cremona, but because its territory was insufficient, the evictions were extended into neighbouring Mantua, where Virgil had his farm. According to Donatus, Virgil, by the favour his *carmina* had won him, regained his possessions, through the intercession on the one hand of Octavian himself, on the other hand of Maecenas and a committee of three persons charged with the distribution of the lands, consisting of Alfenus Varus, Asinius Pollio, and Cornelius Gallus. At first sight, the *carmina* in question cannot be the *Bucolics* themselves, and probably Donatus does not mean they are.⁹ Yet his reason for giving the historical background to begin with is the suggestion *an ideo potius Bucolica scripsit, ut ... facultatem haberet captandae Caesaris indulgentiae repetendique agri ...?*, "or did he rather write the *Bucolics* in order ... to have the possibility of catching the favour of Caesar [i.e. Octavian] and regaining his land ...?" (60). So there is a certain double vision: the *Bucolics* praise Caesar for favours they have themselves been instrumental in soliciting.

The same double vision may be observed in the introduction to the *Bucolics* in the commentary of Servius, which is largely dependent on

⁷ On Servius and "Servius auctus" (or "Servius Danielis") and their relationship to Donatus, see Brugnoli (1988), P.L. Schmidt in Herzog and Schmidt (1989) 148–152. It may be noted in this context that Servius (*ad Ecl.* 2.1) sees *Ecl.* 2 as praise (he uses the verb *laudare*) of Alexis (or rather of the real-life boy supposedly represented by Alexis); likewise Calp. *Ecl.* 4.75 and Apul. *Apol.* 10.

⁸ The land distributions are also mentioned and connected with Virgil's *Bucolics* in the commentaries of Servius and Servius auctus, as well as in other late-antique commentaries; the relevant passages are printed together in Diehl (1911) 51–53. It has been endlessly debated what may and may not be deduced from these sources (see Horsfall (1995) 12–13, with references), and I will not presume on any specific reconstruction of 'what really happened'.

⁹ The reference is doubtless to the *carmina* of Menalcas mentioned and quoted in *Ecl.* 9.7–13, 26–29; cf. Serv. auct. *ad Ecl.* 9.10, 11, 27. Because Menalcas was identified with Virgil, his *carmina*, quoted in the *Bucolics*, might be taken as representative of the *Bucolics* (which likewise incorporate references to the contemporary political reality); cf. below, section 4.

Donatus, but is sometimes more precise or detailed.¹⁰ Servius specifies that Virgil went to Rome, and that it was there that *potentium favore meruit, ut agrum solus reciperet*, “through the favour of powerful people he accomplished that he was the only one to regain his lands” (p. 3.4–5 Th.). But then, Servius continues, complications ensued, and in these Virgil used his *Bucolics* to achieve his aims (5–14). Yet Servius has the same view of Virgil’s *intentio* as Donatus: *ut imitetur Theocritum ... et aliquibus locis per allegoriam agat gratias Augusto uel aliis nobilibus, quorum fauore amissum agrum recepit*, “to imitate Theocritus ... and in some passages to pay thanks, through allegory, to Augustus or the other nobles through whose favour he regained the land he had lost” (p. 2.14–19 Th.). The wording *agat gratias*, “to pay thanks”, puts the praise firmly in a context of patronage: Virgil writes as someone who has a debt to absolve.¹¹ The manner in which he does this is “through the use of allegory”, and here Servius concurs with Donatus, who had explained that, whereas Theocritus wrote without allegory (*simpliciter*), Virgil occasionally employed it, and that this should be conceded to him *propter laudem Caesaris et amissos agros*, “because of the praise of Caesar and the lost lands” (66). Servius speaks of a *necessitas* (p. 2.20 Th.) to use allegory, obviously meaning the need to pay thanks for the restitution of the lands.¹²

If we look at Servius’ practice as a commentator, we find that his allegorical readings are not confined to the context of the land distributions. He discovers e.g. metapoetic allegory in some descriptions of the herdsmen’s activities: herding sheep or goats is used by Virgil *allegoricos* for writing bucolic poetry (*ad* 10.17, 77), and weaving a basket of slender hibiscus for composing *tenuissimo stilo* (*ad* 10.71); this type of allegory is often accepted by modern commentators, and we will have to return to it.¹³ More contested, already in the ancient commentaries themselves, is historical allegory, in the sense that herdsmen

¹⁰ In order not to complicate the picture unduly, I will not here cite other ancient exegetic material (mostly dependent on Donatus), such as that found in Iunius Filagrus, ps.-Probus, etc.

¹¹ On *gratia* within patronage relationships cf. Nauta (2002) 25.

¹² Cf. Serv. *ad Ecl.* 3.20: *refutandae enim sunt allegoriae in bucolico carmine, nisi cum, ut supra diximus, ex aliqua agrorum perditorum necessitate descendunt*; here the *necessitas* of the poet to use allegory shades into the *necessitas* of the reader to discover allegory; cf. also *ad* l. 71. For brief discussions of the use of allegory in the commentaries of Servius and others on the *Bucolics* see Balavoine (1985) 12–16, Patterson (1987) 30–40, Starr (1995); cf. also Korenjak (2003) 66–74.

¹³ Coleman (1977) accepts all three explanations, Clausen (1994) only the one *ad Ecl.*

are supposed to refer to real-life persons: the commentators debate whether Daphnis in *Ecl.* 5 is an allegory for Julius Caesar, and at various points propose identifications with Octavian (*Augustus*).¹⁴ Interestingly enough, they never do this in connection with the land distributions (the young man in *Ecl.* 1 is assumed to be Octavian himself, not an allegory for him), nor are any herdsmen ever identified with Asinius Pollio, Alfenus Varus or Cornelius Gallus (who all of them figure in the *Bucolics* under their own names) or with Maecenas (who is absent from the *Bucolics*). Apart from a moment in *Ecl.* 3,¹⁵ the only allegory that fits the *necessitas* Servius speaks of is the identification of Tityrus in *Ecl.* 1 and of Menalcas in *Ecl.* 9 with Virgil. In the case of Menalcas this is not explicitly called allegory (although it is by Quintilian),¹⁶ but in the case of Tityrus it is (*ad* 1.28), with the proviso that we should not everywhere recognise Virgil in Tityrus, but only *ubi exigit ratio* (*ad* 1.1). To understand what Servius might mean, we need to look at *Ecl.* 1 itself.

2. *Praise of Octavian: Ecl. 1*

*Mel. Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi
siluestrem tenui Musam meditaris auena;
nos patriae finis et dulcia linquimus arua.
nos patriam fugimus; tu, Tityre, lentus in umbra
formosam resonare doces Amaryllida siluas.
Ti. O Meliboe, deus nobis haec otia fecit.
namque erit ille mihi semper deus, illius aram
saepe tener nostris ab ouilibus imbuet agnus.
ille meas errare boues, ut cernis, et ipsum
ludere quae uellem calamo permisit agresti. (Ecl. 1.1–10)*

10.71; cf. further below, section 4. For comparable notes in Servius see *ad Ecl.* 3.71, 3.111, 5.48, 8.12, 10.31.

¹⁴ Whether Daphnis stands *per allegoriam* for Julius Caesar is debated *ad* 5.20 and *ad* 5 *passim*; cf. below, section 5. Allegorical identification with Octavian is proposed for Alexis in *Ecl.* 2 (*ad* ll. 1, 6, 73), for Amyntas in *Ecl.* 3 (*ad* l. 74), and for Daphnis in *Ecl.* 7 (*ad* l. 21). Augustus also plays a role in the commentary on *Ecl.* 4 as the one in whose honour the poem was (or might have been) written (*ad* ll. 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 15, 20 and 48).

¹⁵ Serv. *ad Ecl.* 3.93 and esp. 96, with reference to an episode of mortal danger for Virgil, which I have omitted from my summary above. Texts and discussion in Diehl (1911) 57–60.

¹⁶ Quint. *Inst.* 8.6.46–47.

(Meliboeus) Tityrus, you, reclining under the cover of a spreading beech, practice a woodland Muse on a slender oat; we¹⁷ leave our country's bounds and the sweet fields. We are exiled from our country; you, Tityrus, relaxed in the shade, teach the woods to echo "beautiful Amar-ryllis". (Tityrus) Meliboeus, a god has granted me this leisure. Yes, he will always be a god to me, his altars will often be stained by a lamb from my sheep-folds. He allowed my cattle to wander, as you see, and myself to play what I please on the rustic reed.¹⁸

These first lines of *Ecl.* 1 recall, as has often been remarked, the first lines of Theocritus' *Id.* 1, an exchange between a shepherd Thyrsis and an unnamed goatherd.¹⁹ That exchange is marked by an elaborate symmetry, which is among other things a symmetry of praise: Thyrsis praises the piping of the goatherd, and in return the goatherd praises Thyrsis' singing; both praise the landscape in which they are placed; and both use the word ἄδύ, "sweet" for the music made by nature and by each other. In Virgil, the symmetry is broken: Meliboeus praises Tityrus' piping as well as his singing, and also the landscape, but he adds that he himself is being exiled from the *dulcia ... arua*, "sweet fields". Tityrus accordingly does not praise Meliboeus: instead he is overwhelmed by the urge (the *necessitas*, Servius might say) to praise someone else: the *deus*, the "god", who has granted him the existence praised by Meliboeus.

In what follows Meliboeus asks Tityrus who this *deus* is (l. 18), but Tityrus does not mention his name; this may perhaps be compared with the practice of Lucretius, who in praising his *deus* does not mention the name of Epicurus.²⁰ But just as in Lucretius, in the eclogue the identity of the *deus* is not left in doubt. Tityrus narrates that he travelled to Rome, and there met a *iuuenis*: that word is the central word of the central line of the poem (l. 42), and is in itself sufficient to identify the *deus* as Octavian.²¹ Moreover, not only the deification itself, but

¹⁷ At first sight, *nos* in contrast with *tu* might be taken as "I" (like *nobis* in l. 6), but Virgil seems to use the ambiguity of the pronoun to suggest that Meliboeus' fate is representative for that of many (cf. the unambiguously plural *nos* in 64); cf. Coleman (1977) *ad* 3–4, Patterson (1987) 2.

¹⁸ Translations from the *Bucolics* are my own, and aim at literalness, not elegance. I have occasionally taken a word or phrase from Alpers (1979) or Lee (1984).

¹⁹ For comparisons of these opening exchanges see Wright (1983) 107–109 = (1999) 117–118, Schmidt (1987) 29–36, Alpers (1996) 21–26.

²⁰ Lucr. 5.1–54; Lucretius' words *deus ille fuit, deus, inclute Memmi* (l. 8) are more closely imitated in *Ecl.* 9 ("*deus, deus ille, Menalca*") (l. 64); cf. below, section 5). Cf. also Lucr. 1.62–79, 3.1–30, 6.1–42.

²¹ See Du Quesnay (1981) 35, 40–44, 133–134.

also Tityrus' insistence on having really *seen* the young man, as well as his promise of monthly offerings (ll. 42–43) are appropriate for a subject expressing his thanks towards a beneficent ruler.²² The *iuuenis* was surrounded by other *diui* (l. 41), but he was the first (*primus*, l. 44) to answer Tityrus' request: *pascite ut ante boues, pueri, summittite tauros*, "feed cattle as before, children, raise bulls" (l. 45). What this exactly means at the level of the represented rustic reality is disputed,²³ but in any case the effect is that, as the opening of the eclogue shows, Tityrus' cattle wander, and he himself plays on his rustic reed. And this suggests a second set of meanings in the young man's words.

In bucolic poetry before Virgil, the herdsman, singer of 'bucolic' in the sense of a type of folk song, had come to represent the poet, writer of 'bucolic' in the sense of a genre of Hellenistic poetry. We find this in a systematic manner in the *Epitaph for Bion*, an anonymous dirge for the bucolic poet Bion.²⁴ There Bion is called "cowherd" (βουκόλος, l. 11, βούτας, ll. 65, 81), and represented in much the same manner as Tityrus is at the beginning of *Ecl.* 1: sitting under trees (l. 21), playing his reed-pipe (ll. 20, 51–56) as his cattle wander (ll. 23–24), and producing an echo (ll. 30–31) by his singing (*passim*) songs of love (ll. 58–69, 83–84). The source of this trope is Theocritus' *Id.* 7, the *Thalysia*, where a poet Simichidas goes out into the country, and there meets a herdsman Lycidas, with whom he exchanges "bucolic song" (l. 49; cf. 36) and by whom he is rewarded with a shepherd's crook (recalling the stick given by the Muses to Hesiod); whereas the herdsman Lycidas is represented as a poet, the poet Simichidas is represented as a herdsman.²⁵ This idyll is evoked in the very first lines of *Ecl.* 1, which recall the end of Lycidas' song: τὸ δ' ὑπὸ δρυσὶν ἢ ὑπὸ πεύκαις / ἅδ' ὁ μελίσσομενος κατεκέκλιτο, θεῖε Κομᾶτα, "you were lying under oaks or under pines, making sweet music, divine Comatas" (ll. 88–89). Later on in the eclogue (ll. 51–58), Meliboeus again praises Tityrus' bucolic existence in terms reminiscent of Theocritus' *Id.* 7.²⁶ Such echoes suggest that in *Ecl.* 1 as well, the

²² See Du Quesnay (1981) 101–106 on the deification, 106–112 on the sacrifice, 132–133 on the motif of seeing.

²³ See esp. Schmidt (1998b), criticising Du Quesnay (1981) 115–138 (his own view already briefly in (1987) 132–136).

²⁴ On the trope of the poet as herdsman in the *Epitaph for Bion* (and probably in Bion himself) see Schmidt (1972) 69–92, Nauta (1990) 134–136. The *Epitaph for Bion* is to be found as [Moschus] 3 in modern editions of the *Bucolici Graeci*.

²⁵ On *Id.* 7 see Hunter (1999) 144–199; cf. also Nauta (1990) 129–133.

²⁶ These lines recall Theocr. 7.135–142; cf. Du Quesnay (1981) 46–47, Wright (1983) 136–137 = (1999) 148.

trope of the herdsman as poet is employed, and that Tityrus in some sense represents Virgil.

Such a reading may find support in the manner in which Virgil at the end of the *Georgics* reverts to the beginning of the *Eclogues*.²⁷ After stating that he composed that work while Octavian was gaining victories in the East, he adds (*G.* 4.563–566):

*illo Virgilium me tempore dulcis alebat
Parthenope studiis florentem ignobilis oti,
carmina qui lusi pastorum audaxque iuuenta,
Tityre, te patulae cecini sub tegmine fagi.*

At that time I Virgil was nurtured by sweet Parthenope [i.e. Naples], flourishing in studies of inglorious leisure, I who played herdsmen's songs and, bold in my youth, Tityrus, sang of you under the cover of a spreading beech.

The last line of the *Georgics*, *Tityre, te patulae cecini sub tegmine fagi*, is virtually identical with the first line of the *Bucolics*, *Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi*, but *recubans* has become *cecini*, and *tu* its object, *te*. Thus Virgil here presents himself as Meliboeus singing the praises of Tityrus. At the same time, he also refers to his own situation by appropriating key-terms of the discourse of Tityrus: *otium* and *ludere* (as well as *dulcis* from Meliboeus' discourse praising Tityrus). Although the word *otium* strictly refers to the time of composition of the *Georgics*, it is easily taken to cover the writing of the *Bucolics* as well, and the adjunct "under the cover of a spreading beech" may be connected with Virgil just as well as with Tityrus. *Ludere* is Tityrus' term for his making rustic music, but it is here applied to Virgil's own *carmina pastorum*, a literal translation of the Greek title *Bucolica* (Βουκολικά).²⁸ Virgil here confirms that Tityrus' bucolic song may represent his own bucolic poetry, and at least in this sense Servius' idea of intermittent allegory may be accepted.²⁹

If we now return to the young man's words in *Ecl.* 1, we find that *pascite ut ante boues* may not only mean "feed cattle as before", but also

²⁷ An interesting example of how already in antiquity the reception of the beginning of the *Bucolics* was combined with that of the end of the *Georgics* is Mart. 9.84.1–4.

²⁸ That *carmina pastorum* translates the title *Bucolica* was noted by Servius *ad loc.*: *CARMINA QUI LUSI PASTORUM qui etiam Bucolica scripsi*. Βουκολικά means *carmina pastorum* in the sense of 'songs by herdsmen' (cf. Nauta (1990) 126–129, 136), but in view of *Tityre, te cecini* Virgil may also hint at a meaning "songs about herdsmen" (cf. below, section 3, on *tua carmina* in *Ecl.* 8.10).

²⁹ Du Quesnay (1981) 32–35 in his discussion of allegory does not take this into account.

"write bucolic poetry as before", and may be taken as being addressed in this sense not only to Tityrus, but also to Virgil. The phrase *pascite* ... *boues* is equivalent to Greek βουκολεῖτε, and evokes the name of the genre, whereas *ut ante* may either suggest that Virgil is enabled to continue what he was already doing, or that he is enabled to continue what others were already doing, viz. Greek poets; if the latter, then the detail that in Rome Octavian was *primus* to sanction the genre might hint that Virgil was the first to take it up in Latin.³⁰ However that may be, a metapoetical reading of the encounter would strengthen the links of the eclogue with Theocritus' *Id.* 7: the meeting of Tityrus and the *iuuenis* would be a version of the meeting of Simichidas (who in antiquity was uniformly identified with Theocritus) and Lycidas; and just as Apollo, the god of poetry, has been recognised behind Lycidas, so he has been recognised behind the figure of Octavian.³¹ But there is also an important difference: Whereas Simichidas met Lycidas in the country, the locale of bucolic poetry, Tityrus had to go to Rome to meet his "god".³² Whether Tityrus may sing or not is decided in the city, and this demonstrates that Virgil's bucolic poetry as well is dependent on forces beyond it.

Precisely because Virgil's eclogue comments on its own preconditions, it is fundamentally different from Tityrus' song. Whereas Tityrus' bucolic (as described by Meliboeus) is entirely traditional, Virgil's bucolic includes not only the Theocritean Tityrus, but also the non-Theo-

³⁰ Cf. *Ecl.* 6.1–2. On *pascite boues* ~ βουκολεῖτε cf. Wright (1983) 116–117 = (1999) 126–127 (who at 120–121 = 130–132 has a somewhat different account of *primus*). The reason for the plural is not immediately obvious; Hanslik (1955) 16–18 explains it (as well as *primus*) as a reference to Hes. *Theog.* 22–34, the poetic initiation of Hesiod in the guise of a herdsman. The word *pueri* is difficult as well: in view of the stress Tityrus lays on *libertas*, on the level of the represented rustic reality it must refer to his unfree (or not yet fully free) status (cf. refs. in n. 23); in any case the retention of his land is combined with the acquisition of his freedom. On a metapoetic reading it might perhaps be associated with the 'freedom' shown in generic innovation: cf. Horace, who contrasts the *imitatores*, *seruum pecus* with himself, who *libera* ... *posui uestigia princeps* by introducing Greek genres into Latin (*Epist.* 1.19.19–35).

³¹ Simichidas identified with Theocritus: cf. e.g. Σ *Id.* 7 arg. (76.9–77.7 W.) and *ad* 7.21 (84.17–85.13 W.), Γένος Θεοκρίτου (1.4–9 W.), *Suda* s.v. Θεοκρίτος, [Theocr.] *Syrinx* 12, and see further Fantuzzi, this volume, pp. 252–255. Various indications in the text, such as the role of an Aratus in Simichidas' song and Simichidas' claim that his songs have reached the throne of "Zeus", indeed suggest some kind of connection with Theocritus; cf. Hunter (1999) 146, 179. On Lycidas as Apollo see Williams (1971), on the *iuuenis* as Apollo see Hanslik (1955) 18–19, Wright (1983) 119–120 = (1999) 130.

³² Both meetings are compared by Van Sickle (1975) 68–70 (and in later publications) and Wright (1983) 125–126 = (1999) 136–137.

critic Meliboeus, whose fate demonstrates that the bucolic world is no longer intact. And in a sense, it is Meliboeus who is the more traditional bucolic herdsman: it is he who speaks the Theocritean lines praising Tityrus' bucolic song (ll. 1–2, 4–5) and bucolic life (ll. 46–58), whereas it is Tityrus who introduces the theme of Rome.³³ It is also Tityrus who breaks the symmetry of praise between the herdsmen by not praising Meliboeus, but his *deus*. Paradoxically, because he is allowed to stay in the bucolic world, he cannot praise Meliboeus, whereas Meliboeus, because he can command no praise beyond his conventional, Theocritean praise of Tityrus, has to leave that world; his injunction *ite capellae*, “go, goats” (l. 74) is identical with the very end of the *Bucolics* (*Ecl.* 10.77). Tityrus may sing of Amaryllis and “feed cattle as before”, but Meliboeus will neither sing nor “feed” (l. 77). And so Meliboeus' praise of Tityrus is combined with bitter invective against the disruption of the bucolic world (ll. 11–12, 70–73). The ancient commentators, who are so ready to read Tityrus' words as Virgil's own praise of Octavian, also read Meliboeus' words as his own criticism.³⁴ And indeed the praise for Octavian is inextricably linked with the criticism: if there were no dispossessions, there would be no need for the saving grace of an intervention by a beneficent ruler. But now that need exists, and with it the need for panegyric (Servius' *necessitas*). And panegyric, as the eclogue demonstrates, disrupts the genre of bucolic poetry. Nevertheless, most of the other eclogues in the *Bucolics* include panegyric.

3. *Praise of Octavian: Ecl. 8*

Ecl. 1 dedicates the *Bucolics* to Octavian, even if his name is not mentioned and the poem contains no explicit formula of dedication. But the identity of the dedicatee is made clear, and his support is shown to be crucial to the completion of the collection. In *Ecl.* 8 we find another dedication, this time with an explicit formula, but still without the men-

³³ For further thoughts on Meliboeus' re-appropriation of the Theocritean tradition *vs* Tityrus' dependence on historical accident see Papanghelis' contribution to this volume, pp. 369–378.

³⁴ Cf. Serv. *ad* 1.12, 27, 70. Criticism of Octavian is also suggested in the notes on *Ecl.* 2.73, 9.5 and 18 (and cf. Serv. auct. *ad* G. 4.564). Such notes in the commentaries on the *Bucolics* are discussed by Patterson (1987) 35–38 and (in the context of critical remarks in the commentaries on the *Georgics* and *Aeneid*) by Thomas (2001) 94–95, 119–120.

tion of a name. Because of the anonymity of the dedicatee, his identity was already contested among the ancient commentators, and is still (or rather again) debated. In the original historical situation, there cannot have been any doubt, but what that historical situation was is no longer self-evident. The issue needs to be briefly reviewed, because it is relevant for the present argument.

Whereas in *Ecl.* 1 panegyric and bucolic are (problematically) combined, in *Ecl.* 8 they are separated. The narration of the eclogue is interrupted after the introduction by the dedication, and afterwards resumed as if nothing had intervened. The speaker of the dedication is not even characterised as a herdsman (*Ecl.* 8.6–13):

*tu mihi, seu magni superas iam saxa Timavi
sive oram Illyrici legis aequoris—en erit umquam
ille dies, mihi cum liceat tua dicere facta?
en erit ut liceat totum mihi ferre per orbem
sola Sophocleo tua carmina digna coturno?
a te principium, tibi desinam—accipe iussis
carmina coepta tuis, atque hanc sine tempora circum
inter uictricis hederam tibi serpere lauros.*

May you for me, whether already you pass the rocks of great Timavus or sail along the coast of the Illyrian sea—Will it ever be at all, that day, when I am allowed to say your deeds? Will it be at all that I am allowed to carry through the whole world songs of you, alone worthy of the Sophoclean buskin? From you my beginning, for you I will end—accept the songs begun at your bidding, and permit that around your brow this ivy creeps among your victorious laurels.

The ancient commentaries already reflect discussion about the identity of the dedicatee: some commentators proposed Octavian, others Asinius Pollio.³⁵ Both proposals were probably no more than guesses: Octavian may have been put forward on the basis of the (chronologically impossible) idea that *Illyrici ... aequoris* refers to Actium, Pollio because he was known to have held a “Dalmatian” triumph and to have written tragedies (to which l. 10 was taken to refer).³⁶ Of course

³⁵ Serv. *ad Ecl.* 8.6 mentions only “Augustus”, but Serv. auct. (as often bringing in material from Donatus suppressed by Servius) *ad l.* 10 knows of an identification with Pollio.

³⁶ On Servius’ persistent dating of the *Bucolics* to the time of Actium see Zetzl (1984). Pollio’s “Dalmatian” triumph is mentioned in Serv. *ad Ecl.* 3.88 and Serv. auct. *ad Ecl.* 4.1; cf. Hor. *C.* 2.1.16 *Delmatico ... triumpho* (and Porphyrio and ps.-Acro *ad loc.*). His tragedies are celebrated elsewhere in the *Bucolics* (*Ecl.* 3.86; see below, section 4), as well as by Horace (*Sat.* 1.10.42–43, *C.* 2.1.9–12); cf. also Tac. *Dial.* 21.7 (the *praetexta* that

modern scholars no longer had Servius' reason to think of Octavian, and this left Pollio, who has held the field since the seventeenth century.³⁷ But in 1971 Glen W. Bowersock reopened the discussion, and argued that the reference is not, as had been generally assumed, to Pollio's triumph over the Parthini (a tribe in Macedonia) in 39 or 38, but to the Illyrian expeditions of Octavian in 35, which resulted in a triumph that he eventually celebrated as part of the triple triumph of 29.³⁸ The historical issues raised by Bowersock are too complex to review here, but a consensus seems to have been reached that the evidence, tangled as it is, does not exclude either hypothesis, so that the question will have to be decided by literary arguments.

The very anonymity of the dedicatee might be taken as a sign that he is Octavian, not mentioned by name in *Ecl.* 1 either.³⁹ Moreover, the tone of the passage, with its prayer-like *seu ... siue*, its passionate impatience (*en erit unquam ... cum liceat ... en erit, ut liceat*), its quotation of *tua dicere facta* from *Ecl.* 4 (there applied to the *puer*) and its allusion to Theocritus' encomium of Ptolemy in *a te principium, tibi desinam*, fit better with an address to Octavian than to Pollio.⁴⁰ This is also true of the request that the dedicatee may allow that the poet's "ivy creeps among your victorious laurels". Quintilian quoted the verse with reference to Domitian (which makes it likely that he considered it as originally referring to Octavian), but embedded it in a different

Pollio mentions in a letter to Cicero (*Fam.* 10.32.5) is not his own work). On l. 10 see further below.

³⁷ Pollio was first proposed by J.J. Scaliger in 1606, apparently independently of Servius auct., who had been published in 1600; see Van Sickle (1981) 21 for the early history of the debate.

³⁸ Bowersock (1971); cf. (1978). His arguments have been extended by e.g. Van Sickle (1981), Köhnken (1984), Schmidt (1987) 197–237, Mankin (1988) and Clausen (1994) 233–244, but Pollio has been defended by e.g. Coleman (1977) 228–230, Nisbet-Hubbard (1978) *ad* Hor. *C.* 2.1.12 and 16, Tarrant (1978), Mayer (1983a), Farrell (1991b), Green (1996) 232–235, and Seng (1999) 64–75.

³⁹ In the context of this discussion it has been denied that the *iuuenis* is Octavian (Mayer (1983) 18, 20, 26; Farrell (1991b) 209, and Green (1996) 226–232), but cf. n. 21. Köhnken (1984) 80, 82 concludes from *Ecl.* 6.11–12 that the name of the addressee must have appeared at the top of the page, but if that passage implies *Varus* as a title, then the conclusion may just as well be that the titles mentioned by Donatus (68) are authentic, and, whereas his title for *Ecl.* 6 is indeed "*Varus*", the one for *Ecl.* 8 is "*Damon*" uel "*Pharmaceutria*"; see n. 63.

⁴⁰ See Clausen (1994) 236–237 and 242 (*ad* 6). The quotation from *Ecl.* 4 is from l. 54 (cf. below, n. 108), the allusion to Theocritus to *Id.* 17.1–4, on which see Hunter (2003a) *ad loc.*

syntactical construction, because his meaning was that Domitian was not only a great political and military leader, but also a great poet (*Inst.* 10.1.92):

nos tamen sacra litterarum colentis feres, Caesar, si non tacitum hoc praeterimus et Virgiliano certe uersu testamur "inter uictrices hederam tibi serpere laurus".

yet you will bear with us who celebrate the rites of literature, Caesar, if we will not silently pass this by and testify at least with a Virgilian verse that "ivy creeps among your victorious laurels".

Quintilian's modification of Virgil's meaning is understandable, because the *hedera* normally is not a crown bestowed *by*, but *upon* poets, as the *Bucolics* themselves emphasise: *hedera crescentem ornate poetam*, "crown with ivy the growing poet" (*Ecl.* 7.25).⁴¹ But that cannot be the meaning here, because *hanc ... hederam*, "this ivy", must be identical with the *carmina* the dedicatee is asked to accept.

Virgil's meaning was more accurately reproduced by Martial in the final epigram of the eighth book of his *Epigrams*, addressing the same Domitian. Martial offers this book of epigrams to Domitian (*carmina ... damus*; cf. *accipe ... carmina* in Virgil), referring to it as "these garlands" (*haec ... sarta*; cf. *hanc ... hederam* in Virgil), and asks the emperor to bear with the poets who honour him (*fer uates, Auguste, tuos*; cf. *sine* in Virgil); he concludes (Mart. 8.82.7–8):

*non quercus te sola decet nec laurea Phoebi:
fiat et ex hedera ciuica nostra tibi.*

not only the oak suits you nor the laurel of Phoebus: let our civic crown of ivy also be made for you.

The *quercus* refers to the *corona ciuica*, conferred for the salvation of citizens, and the *laurea Phoebi* should be taken not as the poet's laurel, but, in view both of the imitation of Virgil and of the dominance of the theme of the triumphal laurel in Book 8, as the triumphator's.⁴² Martial hopes that to these crowns another may be added: "our civic crown", i.e. a crown conferred for the salvation of "us" poets, made out of ivy, because that is the material of poets' crowns. In the context

⁴¹ Servius on both passages (*Ecl.* 7.25 and 8.12) notes *hedera coronantur poetae*. Cf. Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) *ad* Hor. *C.* 1.1.29.

⁴² Schöffel (2002) 691 wrongly takes the laurel as the poet's. The theme of the triumphal laurel in Book 8 is prominent from its very first line (after the dedicatory letter): *Laurigeros domini, liber intrature penates* (8.1.1, a beginning clearly picked up by the end of the book), and is continued in poems 15, 49, 65 and 78. Note that at Ovid, *Tf.* 4.2.51 the triumphal laurel is called *Phoebea lauro*.

of the epigram, “our civic crown” is obviously identical with “these garlands” offered by Martial: accepting the dedication of Martial’s book is an instance of saving poets. In the same manner “this ivy” in Virgil denotes his book, of which Octavian will accept the dedication, and which by doing so he will support.⁴³ He receives a crown of ivy not because he is a poet himself, but because he supports a poet. If Pollio were meant, the thought would have to be “accept this ivy in addition to the ivy with which you are already crowned as a poet”, but there is no indication in Virgil’s text that the dedicatee already wears any other crown than the general’s.

If this is so, l. 10 cannot contain a reference to the addressee’s tragic production, as it would have to do if it were to be translated as “your songs, alone worthy of the Sophoclean buskin”.⁴⁴ On that translation, *tua carmina* would carry its normal sense, rather than anomalously meaning “songs of you”. But the latter sense is not in itself impossible, it is suggested by the preceding *tua facta* and by the entire train of thought, and it is the sense attributed to the words by Servius, who glosses *tuae laudes*.⁴⁵ If it is accepted, then “worthy of the Sophoclean buskin” would not refer specifically to tragedy, but rather to the high style in general.⁴⁶ Virgil would then announce that he postpones celebratory poetry in the high style, in a move that was to become typical of the Latin tradition of the so-called *recusatio*.⁴⁷ At the end of his career he will write panegyric

⁴³ On offering a book as a way of dedicating it cf. Nauta (2002) 121–124 (and 339–340, 365–366 on Mart. 8.82 as a dedication of Book 8 to Domitian). Schmidt (1987) 206 believes that the dedication is of *Ecl.* 8 only, or of 8 together with 10 and 7, but he misses the meaning of *iussis ... coepta tuis* (see below).

⁴⁴ If the line does refer to the addressee’s tragic production and if the addressee is Octavian, the reference must have been made at a time when hopes were still entertained of the latter’s *Ajax* (cf. Suet. *Aug.* 85.2); this was in fact the proposition of Bowersock (1971) and is defended in Clausen (1994) 235–236.

⁴⁵ *Tua carmina* would relate to *te cano* as *tuae laudes* to *te laudo* (cf. also n. 28). Such an interpretation has recently been defended by Van Sickle (1981) 21–22 (and already (1978) 180–181, n. 73), Köhnken (1984), Schmidt (1987) 200–201 and Mankin (1988) 69–70, and contested by Zetzler (1984) 141, n. 6, Farrell (1991b) 206–208, and Clausen (1994) 235, n. 10.

⁴⁶ A suggestion of tragedy is not inappropriate, because not only epic, but also tragedy was considered a celebratory genre, and a tragedian could be characterised as someone who *regum facta / canit* (Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.42–43); cf. Ov. *Am.* 3.1.25 (*Tragoedia* to Ovid) *cane facta uirorum*.

⁴⁷ See Wimmel (1960) 185–186. The best-known examples are the proem to the third book of the *Georgics* (see below), Prop. 2.10.19–26, Ov. *Am.* 3.1.67–70 and the beginning of the *Culex* (8–10); for later instances see Nauta (2006a).

of Octavian (*tibi desinam*),⁴⁸ but even now he has begun by praising him (*a te principium*, referring to *Ecl.* 1). Instead of panegyrics in the high style, still impossible but eagerly anticipated for the future (*en erit ...*), the poet offers his present book: *accipe iussis / carmina coepta tuis*. It remains to be asked what these *iussa* are.

The answer is simple, and cannot have been missed by an ancient reader. When Latin speakers use the verb *iubere* or the noun *iussum*, they need not mean that they have been given an order or a command, but they may merely pick up an imperative, and this imperative may have articulated no more than a polite request or even a concession or a permission.⁴⁹ Thus, readers of the *Bucolics* are referred to imperatives uttered by Octavian, and these they have already encountered: *pascite ut ante boues, pueri, summittite tauros* (*Ecl.* 1.45). These words are Octavian's *iussa*.⁵⁰ I have interpreted them as an authorisation to write bucolic poetry, and if they are, it is fully comprehensible that Virgil may refer to his *Bucolics* as *iussis carmina coepta tuis*. The word *coepta* is at first sight difficult to reconcile with *ut ante*, but *ut ante* may refer (as I have noticed above) to something begun by others (viz. the authors of bucolic poetry in Greek); moreover, *coepta* may refer to the beginning not of the writing, but of the work (where the *iussa* are to be found), and finally *coepta* need not refer to a beginning at all, but may rather stress that the work is an "undertaking", in the sense of something difficult and hazardous. We may compare Virgil's words to Maecenas at the beginning of the third book of the *Georgics*, in a *recusatio* which clearly reworks the present one (ll. 41–42 and 46–48):⁵¹

... tua, Maecenas, haud mollia iussa:
te sine nil altum mens incohat. ...

⁴⁸ Most scholars take *tibi desinam* to refer to the end, whether chronological or compositional, of the *Bucolics* (e.g. Coleman (1977) *ad loc.*, Van Sickle (1978) 181, Schmidt (1987) 200, Mankin (1988) 76), but this neglects the connection with the theme of the deferral of panegyric. I have accepted Köhnken's (1984) demonstration (p. 78) that the parenthesis beginning with *en* (l. 7) ends with *desinam* (l. 11).

⁴⁹ See White (1993) 266–268.

⁵⁰ Schmidt (1987) 206 proposes that the *iussa* are instructions from Octavian prescribing the subject of *Ecl.* 8 (or ordering Virgil to resume bucolic poetry), Clausen (1994) 236 takes them as an "understood fiction", Luther (2002) 47, 81 concludes that the *Bucolics* were "Auftragsdichtung" commissioned by Octavian. Only after drafting my article I saw that Mankin (1988) 74–75 likewise identifies the *iussa* with *Ecl.* 1.45.

⁵¹ The connection between *G.* 3.41–42 and *Ecl.* 8.11–12 was seen by Schmidt (1987) 200, that between *G.* 3.46–47 and *Ecl.* 8.8–9 by Köhnken (1984) 83. The passage from the *Georgics* is likewise concerned with how to begin and end panegyric of Octavian; cf. Nelis (2004) 88–90.

...

*mox tamen ardentis accingar dicere pugnas
Caesaris et nomen fama tot ferre per annos,
Tithoni prima quot abest ab origine Caesar.*

your bidding, Maecenas, not easy to realise: without you my mind undertakes nothing sublime. ... yet soon I will gird myself to say the ardent battles of Caesar and carry his name by fame through as many years as is the distance between Tithonus' first origin and Caesar.

4. *Praise of Pollio, Varus, and Gallus: Ecl. 3, 6, 10, and 9*

I now turn to "the other leaders" or "other nobles" who are praised in the *Bucolics*, and whom the ancient commentators connected with the land divisions, presumably precisely in order to explain that praise. I begin with Asinius Pollio, who is praised in two eclogues, the third and the fourth, of which the fourth will need separate discussion (section 6). In the third, two herdsmen, Damoetas and Menalcas, hold a singing match, in the course of which they celebrate Pollio (*Ecl.* 3.84–87):

Dam. Pollio amat nostram, quamvis est rustica, Musam:

Pierides, utulam lectori pascite uestro.

*Men. Pollio et ipse facit noua carmina: pascite taurum,
iam cornu petat et pedibus qui spargat harenam.*

(Damoetas) Pollio loves our⁵² Muse, rustic though she is: Pierides [i.e. Muses], feed a heifer for your reader. (Menalcas) Pollio himself, too, makes novel songs: feed a bull, such as already thrusts with his horn and whirls up the sand with his feet.

By a deliberate conflation of levels, Pollio appears as a "reader": the bucolic songs sung by the herdsmen would not be read (only listened to), but the bucolic poetry written by Virgil would be, and thus Pollio appears at the same time as a character *in* that poetry and as a reader *of* that poetry.⁵³ The term *amat* makes him into an *amicus*, here also

⁵² Because the context is a poetical contest, one might consider taking *nostram* as 'mine'. But throughout the contest the herdsmen use the first person singular (apart from 67 *nostris*, which is unambiguous after 66 *mihi ... meus*), and *nostra* is better taken to refer to the bucolic song of both herdsmen.

⁵³ Although in *Ecl.* 5 a bucolic song is written down in the rind of a tree (ll. 13–14), and although that song includes a brief *carmen* to be inscribed on a grave (ll. 43–45),

in the sense of "patron": his love for the herdsmen's Muse earns their gratitude, expressed through a sacrifice.⁵⁴ But he is also honoured as a poet in his own right, and the difference between the heifer and the bull corresponds to the difference between the 'smaller' genre of bucolic and the 'greater' genre of tragedy, practiced by Pollio.⁵⁵ In Latin poetry, the connection between the 'size' of sacrifices and of genres recurs in contexts of *recusatio*, when a poet refuses to write the 'great', often panegyric poetry that he alleges others command, but in this passage the higher style is Pollio's own, not that of a possible panegyric in his honour.⁵⁶ In *Ecl.* 6, however, the motif of the sacrificial victim is used somewhat differently, and there it is indeed combined with a *recusatio*.

At the beginning of *Ecl.* 6, i.e. at the beginning of the second half of the *Bucolics*, panegyric epic is deferred, just as it is (as we saw) at the beginning of the second half of the *Georgics*.⁵⁷ See *Ecl.* 6.1–12:

*Prima Syracosio dignata est ludere uersu
nostra neque erubuit siluas habitare Thalea.
cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthus aurem
uellit et admonuit: "pastorem, Tityre, pinguis
pascere oportet ouis, deductum dicere carmen".
nunc ego (namque super tibi erunt qui dicere laudes,
Vare, tuas cupiant et tristia condere bella)
agrestem tenui meditabor harundine Musam:*

reading songs is otherwise alien to Virgilian (as well as to Greek) bucolic (*Ecl.* 4.26–27 is of course different). The *Eclogues* themselves, on the other hand (even though, according to the empowering figure of the genre, presented as herdsman's songs) are read: see *Ecl.* 6.9–12 (quoted below), 10.2.

⁵⁴ On *amare* and *amicus* in the context of literary patronage see Nauta (2002) 14–18. Of course the term *amat* is also motivated by its background in the bucolic tradition: cf. e.g. *et me Phoebus amat* earlier in the same poem (l. 62), as well as Theocr. 5.80–84. For yet another dimension of *amare* in the lines immediately following (ll. 88–89), see below, n. 99.

⁵⁵ On Pollio's tragedies see above, n. 36. Because Tacitus (*Dial.* 21.7) describes their style as harsh and old-fashioned, it is not likely that *noua* claims Pollio for a Callimachean poetics, nor is it possible (in view of the bull) that *noua carmina* means Pollio's more light-hearted verse, mentioned by Plin. *Epist.* 5.3.5.

⁵⁶ On the *recusatio* the standard discussion is Wimmel (1960); cf. also Nauta (2006a). The "Opfervergleich" (Wimmel (1960) 270–271) occurs most notably at Hor. *C.* 4.2.53–60, where Horace's *uitulus* is compared to Iullus Antonius' *tauri* and *uaccae*; cf. also *Paneg. Mess.* 14–17, *Ov. Tr.* 2.73–76, *Stat. Silv.* 1.4.127–131.

⁵⁷ The progression is continued by the beginning of the second half of the *Aeneid*, where *reges* and *horrida bella* are finally announced as the theme (7.37–45); cf. Thomas (1985).

*non iniussa cano. si quis tamen haec quoque, si quis
captus amore leget, te nostrae, Vare, myricae,
te nemus omne canet; nec Phoebus gratior ulla est
quam sibi quae Vari praescripsit pagina nomen.*

The first to have deigned to play in Syracusan [i.e. Theocritean] verse and not to have blushed at inhabiting the woods is my Thalea [a Muse]. When I tried to sing of kings and battles, Cynthus [i.e. Apollo] tweaked my ear and admonished me: “A shepherd, Tityrus, should feed his sheep to be fat, but say a fine-spun song”. Now I (for you will have poets enough, Varus, who wish to say your praises and compose sad wars) will practice a rustic Muse on a slender reed. I do not sing what I am bidden not to. If anybody will yet read this too, if anybody will read it captured by love, then of you, Varus, my tamarisks, of you the entire wood will sing; nor is any page more welcome to Phoebus than one which has written at its head the name of Varus.

As in *Ecl.* 8, there is mention of *iussa* (*Ecl.* 6.9), this time not from (on the interpretation I have defended) Octavian as an Apollo-like figure, but from Apollo himself. The god addresses the poet as a herdsman, thus re-instating the central fiction of *Ecl.* 1, and uses the same name, “Tityrus”. His words to the poet-as-herdsman are a bucolic version of his instructions to Callimachus in the prologue to the *Aetia*, and however familiar Callimachus’ lines may be, I need to quote them (Callim. fr. 1.21–24 Pfeiffer = Massimilla):

καὶ γὰρ ὅτ' εἰ πρώτιστον ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκα
γούνασι, ν, Ἀ[πό]λλων εἶπεν ὁ μοι Λύκιος·
“.....] ... αἰοδέ, τὸ μὲν θύος ὅττι πάχιστον
θρέψαι, τήν Μοῦσαν δ' ὠγαθὲ λεπταλέην·

indeed, when I first placed a writing-tablet on my knees, Lycian⁵⁸ Apollo said to me: “... singer, feed the victim to be as fat as possible, but, my friend, keep the Muse slender, etc.

In Virgil, the victim to be sacrificed to Apollo has become a herdsman’s animal.⁵⁹ The word *pascere* in itself already suggests writing bucolic poetry (as in 1.45), but (as in 1.1–10) the existence of the herdsman-poet is described as a combination of herding and singing. As I have noted, this goes back to the *Epitaph for Bion*, and that text also provides

⁵⁸ On “Lycian” Apollo see Nauta (2006b), on the change to *Cynthus* Clausen (1976).

⁵⁹ Cf. Theocr. 5.80–83. In fact this Theocritean passage may be recalled by the lines in the *Aetia*, which would mean that Virgil re-bucolicised rather than bucolicised; see further Nauta (2006b).

the source for Virgil's opposition of bucolic versus martial *epos* (in the sense of hexameter poetry). See ps.-Moschus 3.80–81.⁶⁰

κείνος δ' οὐ πολέμους, οὐ δάκρυα, Πᾶνα δ' ἔμελλε
καὶ βούτας ἐλίγαινε καὶ ἀείδων ἐνόμει.

he [Bion as opposed to Homer] did not sing of wars, not of tears, but of Pan, and as a cowherd he made music, and singing he herded.

Here we have the “sad wars” (for which there is no precedent in the *Aetia*-prologue), but in Virgil *tristia condere bella* (l. 7), i.e. writing epic, specifically means writing *panegyric* epic: *dicere laudes* (l. 6).⁶¹ As in *Ecl.* 8, the panegyric is deferred, but not to later works of the poet himself (which would be difficult to reconcile with his identity as a herdsman), but to the work of others; this type as well was to become common in the Latin tradition of the *recusatio*.⁶² The deferral, placed at the beginning of the poem, acts as a dedication, but in this case not of the collection as a whole, but only of the poem itself, which is identified by Varus' name at its head. This might refer to the mention of the name in the dedication (ll. 7, 12), but in view of later uses of *praescribere* more probably refers to an original title, afterwards lost in the transmission; and indeed Donatus mentions titles for all individual eclogues, of which *Varus* for this eclogue is one (l. 68).⁶³ The value of the dedication is dependent on the value of the poem it introduces. Hence Virgil writes that if the reader loves even this bucolic poem, then this bucolic poem as a whole will bring honour to its dedicatee.

As in *Ecl.* 8, the opposition between bucolic and panegyric is connected with an opposition between styles. In *Ecl.* 8 the panegyric

⁶⁰ For the presence of the *Lament for Bion* see Paschalis (1995b), who does not however remark on the link between *tristia bella* and οὐ πολέμους, οὐ δάκρυα (which was noted by Schmidt (1972) 254).

⁶¹ Virgil is thinking of the many panegyric epics of his day, in which the deeds of a great general were celebrated, such as the *Bellum Sequanicum* by Varro of Atax (on Julius Caesar) or the *Bellum Siculum* of Cornelius Severus (on Octavian). Cf. White (1993) 78–82, Cameron (1995) 287–289, 463–471 (who sometimes too strongly opposes “panegyric” and “epic”). It is not known what Varus' *bella* were; cf. Clausen (1994) *ad* ll. 6–7, Starr (1994).

⁶² The best-known example is Hor. C. 1.6.1 (quoted below, p. 323); see further Nisbet-Hubbard (1970) *ad loc.*, and for later instances Nauta (2006a).

⁶³ Cf. also Serv. *ad loc.*: *pagina ... quae Vari nomen gestat in titulo*. See Schröder (1999) 226–238, who considers it quite possible that the titles reported by Donatus are authentic (in the case of the double titles “*Varus*” uel “*Silenus*” (for *Ecl.* 6) and “*Damon*” uel “*Far-maceutria*” (for *Ecl.* 8) those mentioned first). For *praescribere* of titles cf. Colum. 9.pr.2, Gell. 5.21.10 and 11.16.7.

style was associated with the “Sophoclean buskin”, here the bucolic style is characterized (together with its subject-matter) in terms of Callimachean refinement. Callimachus’ λεπταλέην is bucolicised as *deductum*, a metaphor derived from the threads spun from the wool of the shepherd’s sheep,⁶⁴ and also as *tenui*, said of the shepherd’s pipe. The formulations here are very close to those at the beginning of *Ecl.* 1, thus confirming a poetological reading of that passage: *ludere* (*Ecl.* 6.1; cf. 1.10), *siluas ... agrestem* (6.2–8; cf. *siluestrem ... agresti*, 1.2–10), *Tityre* (6.4; cf. 1.1), *agrestem tenui meditabor harundine Musam* (6.8; cf. *siluestrem tenui Musam meditaris auena*, 1.2), as well as the sacrifice prepared for Apollo (6.4–5; cf. 1.7–8). Also the claim of primacy in bucolic (6.1) in response to *iussa* (6.9) may be connected with *Ecl.* 1.44–45.⁶⁵ And the name “Tityrus”, even if it does not identify the Tityrus of *Ecl.* 6 with that of *Ecl.* 1, certainly confirms that also the Tityrus of *Ecl.* 1 represents, in a sense, the poet.

But *Ecl.* 6 also contains another poetic initiation: that of Gallus, reported in the song of Silenus which forms the larger part of the poem. As the initiation of “Tityrus” is related to the prologue to the *Aetia* (fr. 1 Pf. = M.), so the initiation of Gallus is related to the beginning of the *Aetia* themselves, the poet’s dream of his meeting with the Muses on Mt Helicon (fr. 2 Pf. = 3–4 M.). Although Gallus receives *calamos* (l. 69) from *Linus ... pastor* (l. 67), it is not bucolic poetry that he is going to write, nor is it panegyric: what he will say on the pipes is the origin of the Grynean wood (l. 72), in other words the poetry he will write is aetiological. The poetological resonances of this passage are various and complex, and cannot be discussed here;⁶⁶ it must suffice to state that the lines on Gallus may be considered praise, but praise of his poetry, and that this poetry is characterised as different from, but related to Virgil’s: Gallus is encouraged to tell of the Grynean wood *ne quis sit lucus quo se plus iactet Apollo*, “that there may not be a grove in which Apollo may glory more” (l. 73), which recalls what Virgil says of his own eclogue: *nec Phoebus gratior ulla est / ... pagina*, “nor is any page more welcome to Phoebus” (ll. 11–12). In *Ecl.* 10, Virgil devotes an

⁶⁴ This is the first instance of the frequent poetological use of *deductum*. Virgil may have been inspired by the circumstance that the adjective λεπταλέος (on which see Nauta (2006b)) was also used for textiles (e.g. Callim. *SH* 254.15, adesp. *SH* 949.7–8, Apoll. Rhod. 2.30–31, 3.874–875, 4.169, Antip. Sid. *AP* 6.174.2 = *HE* 191).

⁶⁵ Cf. above, section 1.

⁶⁶ Notable discussions of the passage (and its context) include Schmidt (1972) 238–298 and Ross (1975) 18–38.

entire poem to Gallus, and there again the theme is Gallus' poetry as related to Virgil's own bucolic.⁶⁷ That poetry is "slender" and "low",⁶⁸ but the Muses will make it *maxima Gallo* (10.72). As in *Ecl.* 6, the poet's laudatory commitment makes his bucolic valuable to his dedicatee.

Praise of Varus through deferral of praise is also to be found in *Ecl.* 9. This eclogue is often discussed together with the first, and the two poems are indeed closely linked. They both create meaning by a series of correspondences and differences with Theocritus' *Id.* 7.⁶⁹ In *Ecl.* 1 the scene of the meeting with the authorising semi-divine figure is transferred from the country to the city, and in *Ecl.* 9 there is a similar inversion. The beginning, in which a Lycidas addresses a Moeris, recalls the first words of Theocritus' Lycidas to Simichidas, but specifies the direction of the movement as *in urbem* "to the city" (9.1), whereas in the beginning of the *Thalysia* it was given as ἐκ πόλιος, "from the city" (Theocr. 7.2). As in *Ecl.* 1, the dependence of bucolic poetry on the political realities, symbolised by the city, is at issue, and, as in *Ecl.* 1, these realities take the form of confiscations of land. Moeris complains that an outsider has taken possession of his plot, and explains to Lycidas that, contrary to rumour, Menalcas has not been able to save a certain stretch of land (apparently including that of Moeris) *carminibus*, "by his songs" (9.10). The herdsmen then recall fragments of Menalcas' songs, Lycidas three verses closely modelled on Theocritus (9.23–25), but Moeris lines of a more political import, which may well be an instance of the unsuccessful *carmina* he mentioned earlier (9.26–29):

Moer. Immo haec, quae Varo necdum perfecta canebat:
"Vare, tuum nomen, superet modo Mantua nobis,
Mantua uae miserae nimium uicina Cremonae,
cantantes sublime ferent ad sidera cycni".

(Moeris) Rather this, which he sang to Varus, not yet finished: "Varus, your name, if only Mantua may remain for us, Mantua, ah, too near to unhappy Cremona, will be carried aloft to the stars by the swans in their singing".

⁶⁷ Studies of *Ecl.* 10 include Conte (1984) 13–42 and Rumpf (1996).

⁶⁸ The phrase *gracili fuscillam textit hibisco* (*Ecl.* 10.71; of the poet) was already interpreted meta-poetically by Servius *ad loc.* (cf. above, section 1). A similar interpretation may be given of *sedet* (10.71) in combination with *surgamus* (10.75): the end of the *Bucolics* marks the transition to a higher genre; cf. Wright (1983) 113 = (1999) 122–123.

⁶⁹ For *Ecl.* 9 and *Id.* 7 see, e.g., Schmidt (1987) 179–196, Neumeister (1975), Henderson (1998) 164 (where "*Idyll* 6" is a misprint for "*Idyll* 7").

According to the ancient commentators (as well as Quintilian and Martial), Menalcas here is an allegory for Virgil,⁷⁰ and there are indeed a number of pointers to some kind of identification: the expectation raised by the references to Theocritus' *Id.* 7 that the poet will discuss his own poetry, the circumstance that at the end of *Ecl.* 5 (ll. 85–87) a Menalcas identifies himself as the author of *Ecl.* 2 and 3, and the reference to Mantua, Virgil's birthplace. In the *Georgics* Virgil again commiserates with Mantua for the loss of its plain, and mentions that this plain feeds swans (2.198–199). So the swans in the eclogue are the swans of Mantua, expressing the town's gratitude.

But as soon becomes clear, the swans also have a poetological connotation. Lycidas, taking the role of Simichidas in Theocritus, invites Moeris to a poetic competition, and just as Simichidas had claimed that he was a good singer, but as yet no match for Sicelidas (i.e. Asclepiades) and Philitas (Theocr. 7.37–41), so Moeris now claims that he is a good singer, but as yet no match for Cinna and Varius (*Ecl.* 9.32–36). See especially 9.35–36:

*nam neque adhuc Vario uideor nec dicere Cinna
digna, sed argutos inter strepere anser olores.*

for I do not yet seem to say what is worthy of Varius or Cinna, but to cackle as a goose among clear-voiced swans.

The comparison of Varius and Cinna with swans may have to do not only with the quality of their poetry, but also with the fact that they wrote in higher kinds of epos. Cinna was the author of a famous *propempticon* (farewell-poem) to Pollio, whereas Varius was celebrated by Horace as an author of epic, and more specifically as a potential author of panegyric epic on Agrippa; it is interesting that the latter context again seems to use the image of the swan (Hor. *C.* 1.6.1–2):⁷¹

⁷⁰ See Serv. and Serv. auct. *ad Ecl.* 9 *passim*, Quint. *Inst.* 8.6.46–47, Mart. 8.55 (56).7–8 (Martial calls Virgil *Tityrus* (l. 8), thinking of *Ecl.* 1 (cf. *rura* (l. 6), *abductas* ... *oues* (l. 8)) as well as *Ecl.* 6 (cf. *bella* (l. 4), *pinguis* (l. 17) and other motifs of the *recusatio*), but his quotation from *Buc.* 9.28 (l. 7) shows that this Tityrus is identified with the Menalcas of *Ecl.* 9). For the role of this allegoresis in the ancient reconstructions of Virgil's *intentio* in writing the *Bucolics* see above, section 1 (esp. n. 9).

⁷¹ On Cinna's *Propempticon* Pollionis see *FLP* 214–217. Horace on Varius: *Sat.* 1.43–44 (*forte epos acer / ut nemo Varius ducit*) and *C.* 1.6; on *alite* as “swan” see Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) *ad loc.* It must be said that no panegyric epic of Varius is known; the *Laudes Augusti* mentioned by Porphyrio and ps.-Acro on Hor. *Epist.* 1.16.25 may be an *ad hoc* fabrication of the commentators; see Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 81, *FLP* p. 275 (but Cameron (1995) 464 is less sceptical).

*Scriberis Vario fortis et hostium
uictor Maeonii carminis alite.*

Brave and a victor over enemies, you will be written by Varius, a bird of Maeonian [i.e. Homeric] song.

So, whereas the *carmina* with which Menalcas had tried to save parts of Mantua's territory were presumably bucolic, he anticipated that the praise he would have to utter on Mantua's behalf if his intervention succeeded had to be epic, and no longer bucolic. What he had done in bucolic was praising by promising praise. But not only has the promised epic praise not materialised (because the condition on which it was made dependent has not been fulfilled), even the bucolic promise of praise is incomplete, as if it had already proved vain before it was even finished.⁷²

Bucolic song in *Ecl.* 9 remains fragmentary. The poetic contest proposed by Lycidas cannot be held, because Moeris has forgotten the songs of Menalcas that Lycidas invites him to sing. With difficulty the herdsmen manage to recall fragments of two; as with the earlier pair of fragments, the first (ll. 39–43) is Theocritean, the other Roman and political (ll. 46–50).⁷³ But Moeris gives up; the herdsmen will not sing as they go, like the herdsmen in the *Thalysia*, and their goal is not a country festival, but the city where Moeris has to make his payment to the new owner of his land. Moeris can only point to Menalcas as the one who will be able to sing his songs (ll. 55, 67), but Menalcas is absent. This means that, in so far as Menalcas is the bucolic poet Virgil, Virgil thematises his own absence from his eclogue.⁷⁴ But Virgil is of course the author of the eclogue; he has written a bucolic poem showing how bucolic poetry is disrupted by its dependence on the political world. This again links *Ecl.* 9 to 1, but in *Ecl.* 9 nothing corresponds to the success of Tityrus. In the first of the fragments quoted from Menalcas there is indeed a Tityrus, and he even receives the imperative *pasce*, “feed”, but he is neither in the possession of poetic autonomy nor of Amaryllis: as in Theocritus (and elsewhere in the *Bucolics*),⁷⁵ he is a subordinate, bidden to replace Menalcas for as long as the latter is with

⁷² Schmidt (1987) 183 explains the incompleteness of the fragment from its impossibility as praise; but it is promise of praise, and its incompleteness as such must have a different explanation. Cf. also Henderson (1998b) 159.

⁷³ Lines 46–50 will be discussed below, section 5.

⁷⁴ For further thoughts on Menalcas' absence, and on the fragmentary character of the quoted songs, see Papanghelis, this volume, pp. 387–390.

⁷⁵ Theocr. 3.1–5, Virg. *Ecl.* 3.96, 5.12.

Amaryllis (l. 22): *Tityre, dum redeo (brevis est uia) pasce capellas*, “Tityrus, until I return (the road is short) feed the goats” (l. 23). At the end of the eclogue Menalcas’ return is expected, but not apparently imminent: *carmina tum melius, cum uenerit ipse, canemus* “we will sing songs better then when he comes himself” (l. 67).⁷⁶

5. Praise of Julius Caesar: Ecl. 9 and 5

The second panegyric fragment in *Ecl.* 9 is concerned not with one of Virgil’s patrons, but with the deceased Julius Caesar; for that reason I discuss it under a new heading. In this case there is no promise of panegyric in another genre, but the praise is integrated into the bucolic context (9.46–50):

*“Daphni, quid antiquos signorum suspicis ortus?
ecce Dionaei processit Caesaris astrum,
astrum quo segetes gauderent frugibus et quo
duceret apricis in collibus uua colorem.
insere, Daphni, piro: carpent tua poma nepotes”.*

“Daphnis, why are you looking up at the risings of the ancient constellations? Look, the star of Caesar, descendant of Dione [i.e. Venus], has come forth, the star through which our fields might rejoice in crops and through which the grape might put on colour on the sunny hills. Graft pears, Daphnis: your grand-children will pluck the fruits”.

What is here called the *Caesaris astrum* is better known (though incorrectly) as the *sidus Iulium*.⁷⁷ At the funeral games held for Julius Caesar by Octavian in July 44 a comet appeared, which was interpreted by Octavian as a star signifying the divinisation of Julius Caesar.⁷⁸ We know from the commentary of Servius, however, that the comet was also interpreted as inaugurating a final, apparently baneful, *saecu-*

⁷⁶ It is as if the *brevis* ... *uia* is not so short after all, and at least as long as the *uia* into town (*Ecl.* 9.1, 59, 64). Readers may also realise that *dum redeo (brevis est uia)* is a Virgilian addition to the Theocritean beginning (*Theocr.* 3.3–5) of a song that ends with the proclamation of the singer that he no longer sings (οὐκέτι ἀείδω) and does not intend to return (3.52–54). On the ‘suspension’ at the end of *Ecl.* 9 see also Papanghelis, this volume, p. 399 (and cf. his pp. 386–387 on ‘getting the quotes wrong’, on which my suggestions here depend).

⁷⁷ The phrase is from Hor. *C.* 1.12.47, but there refers to Augustus (even though with a side-glance at the *Caesaris astrum*). See Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) *ad loc.*

⁷⁸ For all questions surrounding Caesar’s comet see Ramsey and Licht (1997).

lum.⁷⁹ Even though Octavian championed the interpretation as Caesar's star, there must have been discussion about the beginning of a new *saeculum* (which was widely expected in these years), and a positive interpretation must have been put forth to counter the negative one reported by Servius.⁸⁰ We see this reflected in Virgil's text, where the star presides over a long period of prosperity, the length being expressed by the reference to the *nepotes*. The praise of the *Caesaris astrum*, in any case, must redound to the person who exploited it for his own propaganda, i.e. Octavian. But the praise is presented as something that Moeris has forgotten, as something which has become obsolete through the evictions: no *nepotes* will be there to pluck the fruits when the *ueteres ... coloni*, the "old cultivators" (l. 3), are being expelled. This point of view is expressed with bitter sarcasm by the dispossessed Meliboeus in *Ecl.* 1.73: *insere nunc, Meliboe, piro*s, "now graft pears, Meliboeus". Whether a reader reads *Ecl.* 9 and recalls 1, or re-reads 1 and recalls 9,⁸¹ in either case the praise of Octavian is qualified. Yet Moeris confidently expects that Menalcas will return to sing the song of the *Caesaris astrum* (9.55); the possibility that bucolic may still be panegyric is left open in the end (cf. 9.67).

The theme of divinisation in combination with the address to Daphnis recalls *Ecl.* 5. In this poem Menalcas challenges Mopsus to a singing match;⁸² one of the themes he proposes is *Alconis ... laudes* (l. 11), and in the end the herdsmen do exchange *laudes* (l. 78), but of the deceased Daphnis. After Mopsus has described nature's mourning at his death, Menalcas announces that he will "carry Daphnis to the stars" (ll. 51–52). He then proceeds to do so, not only metaphorically, by praising Daphnis (in the same way as in *Ecl.* 9 the swans are expected to carry Varus to the stars), but also literally, by describing how Daphnis has been taken up to heaven, where he has become a *deus*, a god (l. 64).⁸³

⁷⁹ Serv. auct. *ad* 9.46; see Ramsey and Licht (1997) 140–142. Negative interpretations of the comet are also attested by Cass. Dio 45.7.1.

⁸⁰ See Ramsey-Licht (1997) 142–145. Augustus later admitted that the "star" was in fact a comet (Pliny, *NH* 2.94).

⁸¹ Servius takes *Ecl.* 9.50 to be a re-assuring reference to 1.73 (*ac si diceret, nihil est quod possis timere*), but surely Meliboeus' fears are not simply cancelled by Menalcas' exhortation.

⁸² The words in which he does so are close to those used by Lycidas in *Ecl.* 9: *incipere ... si quos ... / ... habes* (5.10–11) ~ *incipere, si quid habes* (9.32). In *Ecl.* 9, the words *desine plura, puer* (l. 66) confirm that the singing match will not take place, in the fifth they mark its beginning (l. 19).

⁸³ Menalcas does not merely use the figure whereby a poet is represented as effecting

This *deus* is reminiscent of the one in *Ecl.* 1, in that he grants *otia* (5.61; cf. 1.6) and is honoured with altars and yearly offerings (5.66–68; cf. 1.7–8, 42–43); just as behind that god we could see Octavian, behind this one *Ecl.* 5 prompts us to see his adoptive father, Julius Caesar.⁸⁴ Already the ancient commentaries debate whether we should interpret Daphnis *simpliciter*, as just a herdsman, or *per allegoriam*, as Julius Caesar.⁸⁵ Whether we see ‘allegory’ or not depends on the meaning we attach to that word; it is obvious that the pastoral *puer* (*Ecl.* 5.54) has a number of characteristics not shared by Julius Caesar, but on the other hand his death and apotheosis must have recalled that of the Roman statesman. The praise of the deceased Julius Caesar must therefore have been interpreted as praise for those who claimed his inheritance, and in view of the connection with *Ecl.* 1, especially of Octavian.⁸⁶

After the two songs, the poem ends with an exchange of gifts, modelled on the conclusion of *Id.* 6, where the herdsmen exchange pipes (a *syrix* for an *aulos*) (l. 43). Menalcas likewise gives a pipe (a *cicuta*), but he specifies (*Ecl.* 5.85–87) that this is the instrument on which he has played *Ecl.* 2 and 3, so that the gift becomes expressive of a poetic initiation.⁸⁷ Mopsus reciprocates by offering Menalcas a herdsman’s crook, one which, he claims, he has earlier withheld from Antigenes (5.88–90); the crook of course recalls the crook given by Lycidas to Simichidas in *Id.* 7.128–129, where the name Antigenes likewise occurs (l. 4).⁸⁸ The

what he describes (as Coleman (1977) *ad* l. 51 comments), but he literally effects Daphnis’ apotheosis through his poetry; cf. Schmidt (1972) 213–214.

⁸⁴ For the connections between *Ecl.* 1 and 5 in this respect see also Papangelis in this volume, pp. 376–377. Note also the stress that the honours paid the *deus* will last *semper* (1.7, 5.74, 78), as long as nature runs its normal course (1.59–63, 5.76–78, the words *piscis* (*pisces*) and *pascentur* occurring in both passages).

⁸⁵ Serv. *ad Ecl.* 5.20; cf. further *ad* ll. 29, 34, 44, 54, 65; Serv. auct. *ad* l. 56. On Julius Caesar’s presence in *Ecl.* 5 see esp. Du Quesnay (1976/77) 30–34 = (1999) 371–379, Coleman (1977) 173–174.

⁸⁶ Du Quesnay (1976/77) 34 = (1999) 378–379 thinks rather of Pollio, in connection with a hypothetical republication of part of the *Bucolics* in 42–41. I rather try to read the collection as it was published (and this happened not earlier than 35; cf. above, section 2, on the date of the *recusatio* in *Ecl.* 8).

⁸⁷ For further interpretation of Menalcas’ and Mopsus’ gifts cf., e.g., Schmidt (1972) 223–238.

⁸⁸ Virgil’s *pedum*, described by Festus as a *baculum incuruum, quo pastores utuntur ad comprehendendas oves aut capras a pedibus* (p. 292 L. = 249 M.) is exactly the same object as Theocritus’ λαγυβόλον (*Id.* 7.128) or πορύνα (7.19, 43); see Gow (1952) *ad* 4.49, Cameron (1995) 415. The name of Mopsus’ rival Amyntas (*Ecl.* 5.8, 15, 18) also occurs in *Id.* 7.2, 132, and the description of the rustic feast in Menalcas’ song (*Ecl.* 5.67–73) recalls that in Lycidas’ song in *Id.* 7.63–72, as well as the Thalyisia themselves in *Id.* 7.151–155;

symmetry of the poetic initiations contrasts with the asymmetry of *Ecl.* 1, and unlike in *Ecl.* 1, in *Ecl.* 5 there is symmetry of praise as well. Not only do the herdsmen both praise Daphnis, they also praise each other's praise, as Servius notes: *laudant se et sibi inuicem cedunt*, "they praise each other and give way to each other in turn" (*ad l. 1*).⁸⁹ In this eclogue, it is still possible to incorporate praise into the bucolic world. Mopsus in his lament has the animals mourn Daphnis' death (ll. 24–28), an instance of the pathetic fallacy derived from the dirges for Daphnis in Theocritus;⁹⁰ also, he has thistles and thorns spring up in place of the violet and the narcissus (ll. 38–39), a motif related to the dying Daphnis' wish in Theocritus that violets may grow on brambles and thorns, and the narcissus on the juniper, and that the stag may worry the hounds (Theocr. 1.132–136).⁹¹ The function of such ἀδύνατα (impossibilities) is reversed in Menalcas' song, where Daphnis' apotheosis effects that the sheep no longer need to fear the wolf (*Ecl.* 5.60).⁹² As in *Ecl.* 9, the divinisation inaugurates a new *saeculum*, but that *saeculum* is here described in more eschatological terms, prompting associations with the Golden Age. Such associations are more systematically put into the service of panegyric in *Ecl.* 4.

6. Praise of an unborn boy: *Ecl.* 4

Sicelides Musae, paulo maiora canamus!
non omnis arbusta iuuant humilesque myricae;
si canimus siluas, siluae sint consule dignae. (*Ecl.* 4.1–3)

Sicilian Muses, let us sing of something a little greater! Not all are pleased by shrubs and lowly tamarisks; if we sing of woods, let the woods be worthy of a consul.

moreover, Daphnis' death is one of the themes of Tityrus' song as reported in Lycidas' song (*Id.* 7.73–77).

⁸⁹ Similar remarks *ad Ecl.* 5.45 (*laudant se inuicem*) and 81 (*ille eum ... laudauerat, hic ... laudat*).

⁹⁰ See Theocr. 1.71–75 (with Hunter (1999) 89 *ad loc.*), 7.74. Pathetic fallacy is also a dominant element in Bion's *Epitaph for Adonis* and ps.-Moschus' *Epitaph for Bion*.

⁹¹ See Hunter (1999) 102–103 *ad loc.*

⁹² This motif occurs in Theocritus at *Id.* 24.86–87, in a passage which is probably interpolated (see Gow (1952) *ad loc.*, but against Schmidt (1972) 168–169, with references), but may well have been in Virgil's text. Gow notes that "λύκος ὃν ποιμαίνων is proverbial ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀδυνάτου (Diogen. 5.96, Apost. 14.96; cf. Aristoph. *Pax* 1076)".

The invocation of the Sicilian Muses and the mention of *silvae* indicate that the poem will be bucolic,⁹³ but the word *maiora* may suggest that it will be panegyric;⁹⁴ in any case the reason for the poem being “greater” is that it celebrates a consul. One might ask why *Ecl.* 1, with its celebration of Octavian, and *Ecl.* 5, with its celebration of Julius Caesar, are not in this sense “greater”,⁹⁵ and the answer may have to do with the circumstance that neither Octavian nor Caesar is actually mentioned. Octavian appears as a mysterious *iuuenis*, whereas Caesar is no more than glimpsed behind the pastoral hero Daphnis; neither receives a formal panegyric. The consul, however, is mentioned: he is identified as Pollio (4.12), who is honoured as Virgil’s patron in *Ecl.* 3 (see above, section 4). His consulate, moreover, transforms the bucolic world to a higher degree than the *iussa* of the *iuuenis* or the apotheosis of Daphnis. As soon as this consulate is described, the word “great” is used again: *magnus ab integro saeculorum nascitur ordo / ... incipient magni procedere menses*, “the great series of ages is born anew ... great months will begin to proceed” (4.5–12).⁹⁶ Virgil proclaims that a prophecy of a Cumaean Sibyl will be fulfilled in the birth of a boy, who will bring about a new Golden Age.⁹⁷ This Golden Age is described in terms of its effects on the life of herdsmen: goats will bring back full udders of their own accord (ll. 21–22), cattle will no longer need to fear lions (l. 22), snakes will perish (l. 24),⁹⁸ and the fleeces of the flocks will be dyed spontaneously (ll. 42–45). A further motif, that of the spontaneous abundance of agricultural products, including wine and honey (ll. 28–30), is also to be found in the bucolic tradition, as an effect of

⁹³ The invocation of the Sicilian Muses is a common generic marker in post-Theocritean bucolic; cf. the refrain in the *Epitaph for Bion* (Σικελικάι ... Μοῖσαι), [Bion] 2.1 (Σικελὸν μέλος), and, in Virgil himself, *Ecl.* 6.1–2 (quoted above, p. 317) and the invocation to the Sicilian spring Arethusa in *Ecl.* 10.1 (with Clausen (1994) *ad loc.*). With *silvae* cf., likewise at the beginning of an eclogue, 1.2–5 (*siluestrem ... Musam ... siluas*), 2.5 (*siluis*), 5.7 (*siluestris*), 6.2 (*siluas*), 10.8 (*silvae*).

⁹⁴ Cf. Cameron (1995) 467–471, although all his examples are later, and but for one (Ov. *Fast.* 2.3) are concerned with the deferral of panegyric to another work, not with the announcement of panegyric in the current work.

⁹⁵ The lines on Caesar in *Ecl.* 9.46–50 might also be mentioned, but they do not determine the character of the eclogue as a whole.

⁹⁶ The word *magnus* recurs at *Ecl.* 4.22, 36 (*magnus ... Achilles*), 48, 49.

⁹⁷ In the context of this contribution, I have to simplify the issues having to do with the Sibylline prophecy and the Golden Age. On these matters see most of all Nisbet (1978), with references there given.

⁹⁸ For snakes as a baneful presence in the bucolic world see *Ecl.* 3.93, 8.71.

the presence of the beloved, and is applied in *Ecl.* 3 to Pollio himself (ll. 88–89):⁹⁹

*Dam. Qui te, Pollio, amat, ueniat quo te quoque gaudet;
mella fluant illi, ferat et rubus asper amomum.*

(Damoetas) Who loves you, Pollio, may he come where it is your pleasure too; may streams of honey flow for him, and may the rough bramble bear cardamum.

The *amomum* recurs in *Ecl.* 4.25, but here the subject of the panegyric (as it turns out, in spite of the introductory lines) is not Pollio himself,¹⁰⁰ but the as yet unborn *puer*.

The identity of the boy was contested already in the Early Empire, but cannot have been doubtful either in 40 BC, when Pollio was consul, or a few years later, when the *Bucolics* were published.¹⁰¹ Pollio's major feat as a consul was his contribution to the treaty of Brundisium between Mark Antony and Octavian, sealed by a dynastic marriage between Antony and Octavian's sister Octavia; Virgil's eclogue, which has epithalamian features, must have been taken as a celebration of that marriage and of its hoped-for offspring.¹⁰² The marriage did indeed soon produce a child, but that proved to be a girl (the elder Antonia), born moreover when the enmity between Antony and Octavian had been renewed. But the prophecy contained in the eclogue was ambiguous enough for Virgil to publish it as part of the *Bucol-*

⁹⁹ Cf. [Theocr.] 8.41–48 and Theocr. 5.124–127 (where the motif is used as an *adynaton*, but the reference to the herdsman's beloved in l. 127 shows its origin). In Virgil *amat* indicates that Pollio, who in turn loves (*amat*) the herdsman's Muse (*Ecl.* 4.84; cf. above, n. 54), has usurped the role of the beloved.

¹⁰⁰ Du Quesnay (1977) 43–52 = (1999) 299–308 argues that *Ecl.* 4 is dependent on a pre-existing tradition of consular poetry, but the list of topoi he compiles only demonstrates that the later tradition of such poetry closely follows Stat. *Silv.* 4.1. There are a few correspondences between this tradition and *Ecl.* 4, but these are to be explained from their shared panegyric character and from the circumstance that the eclogue likewise celebrates a beginning (of an age rather than a year), not from an alleged 'genre' whose existence in the time of Virgil is not otherwise known.

¹⁰¹ For a brief survey of the various hypotheses see Coleman (1977) 150–152, for an extensive re-statement of the position adopted here Du Quesnay (1977) 26–43 = (1999) 284–299.

¹⁰² The epithalamian character of the poem is most apparent in its imitation of Catullus 64, especially of the song of the Parcae (46–47); see Du Quesnay (1977) 68–75 = (1999) 322–328. At Stat. *Silu.* 1.2.268–270, the reference to the *decimum ... mensem* and the addresses to *Lucina* and the future *puer* are probably taken from *Ecl.* 4, and may mean that Statius took the poem as an epitalamium (but the almost exactly contemporaneous imitation of *Ecl.* 4 in Mart. 6.3 does not have an epithalamian character).

ics even after its most literal interpretation had been falsified (and a fully literal interpretation of the poem's ἀδύνατα was impossible anyhow).

In spite of the oracular character of the prophecy, the boy is praised in the poem according to all the rules of real-life panegyric, as Servius recognised: *retorice digesta laudatio: non enim improuide in principio uniuersa consumpsit, sed paulatim fecit laudem cum aetate procedere*, “the panegyric is rhetorically structured: Virgil has not been so careless as to exhaust the entire topic at the beginning, but he has made the praise proceed gradually with the stages of life” (*ad Ecl.* 4.18).¹⁰³ The poem first describes the birth of the boy, attended by happy omens (ll. 18–25), then his childhood and education (ll. 21–22), and finally his manhood (l. 37). After the end of this formal panegyric the herdsman-poet announces more, and apparently more important, panegyric (ll. 53–59):

*o mihi tum longae maneat pars ultima uitae,
spiritus et quantum sat erit tua dicere facta!
non me carminibus uincet nec Thracius Orpheus
nec Linus, huic mater quamuis atque huic pater adsit,
Orphei Calliopea, Lino formosus Apollo.
Pan etiam, Arcadia mecum si iudice certet,
Pan etiam Arcadia dicat se iudice uictum.*

O may then remain for me the final part of a long life and breath as much as will be enough to say your deeds! I will not be vanquished in song neither by Thracian Orpheus nor by Linus, even though he be helped by his mother and he by his father, Orpheus by Calliope, Linus by beautiful Apollo. Even Pan, if with Arcadia as judge he compete with me, even Pan will say that with Arcadia as judge he is vanquished.

Two questions arise from this passage. What are the *facta* (l. 54)? And in what genre does the herdsman-poet anticipate to celebrate them?

The only period in which the as yet unborn boy will be able to perform deeds is his adolescence. First he will read of the *heroum laudes et facta parentis*, “praises of the heroes and deeds of his father” (ll. 26–27), then, when he will grow up further,¹⁰⁴ *pauca tamen suberunt priscae uestigia fraudis*, “yet a few traces will linger of our ancient deceit” (l. 31), and wars will be fought (ll. 34–36):

¹⁰³ On the use of panegyric structures and topoi see Du Quesnay (1977) 52–68 = (1999) 308–322.

¹⁰⁴ I assume that *Ecl.* 4.26–36 encompass three stages: childhood (ll. 26–27), puberty (ll. 28–30; cf. Nisbet (1993)), and adolescence (ll. 31–36).

*alter erit tum Tiphys et altera quae uehat Argo
delectos heroas; erunt etiam altera bella
atque iterum ad Troiam magnus mittetur Achilles.*

Then there will be another Tiphys [helmsman of the Argo] and another Argo to carry chosen heroes; there will even be other wars and again great Achilles will be despatched to Troy.

Achilles was a notoriously adolescent hero, and the suggestion seems to be that the boy himself will be this new Achilles, leading an expedition to the Orient.¹⁰⁵ If the herdsman-poet were to celebrate this new Achilles' deeds, he himself would be a new Homer (and, in view of the mention of the Argo, a new Apollonius as well). This would mean that the announced panegyric would be epic. On the other hand, it would be part of a bucolic poetry contest with Pan, and so remain firmly within a bucolic frame of reference.¹⁰⁶ And there is another oddity, because one would expect the most important deeds to be those performed when the boy has grown to be a man. But when that is the case, the Golden Age will have begun (ll. 37–45), which, with its absence of war, will provide no scope for deeds, at least not as normally understood. The major "deed" to be celebrated must be the conservation of the Golden Age, and the announced panegyric must be panegyric of the Golden Age. And such panegyric, which even surpasses traditional epic, may be bucolic.

It is from here that Calpurnius Siculus and others took their clue, when in their bucolic they praised the reign of their ruler as a Golden Age already realised on earth. Virgil himself had contributed to this development, by including in his *Aeneid* the prophecy that the Golden Age would be restored by Augustus himself (6.791–794).¹⁰⁷ But there are three other passages in which Virgil suggests a reinterpretation of the panegyric of *Ecl.* 4, and with these I should like to conclude my contribution. The first is the beginning of *Ecl.* 8 (quoted above, p. 311), where the phrase *tua dicere facta* from *Ecl.* 4 (l. 54) is re-applied to Octavian (l. 8).¹⁰⁸ The second is to be found at the beginning of

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Nisbet (1978) 68 = (1995) 68 = (1999) 270, who notes the relevance (again) of Catull. 64, where the announced child is precisely Achilles.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Theocr. 1.3 (where Pan is the self-evident winner) and [Mosch.] 3.55–56 (where Pan is afraid to be beaten by Bion).

¹⁰⁷ This passage is expressly referred to by Calp. *Ecl.* 1.64, in his description of the Golden Age (cf. 1.42–45) now imminent with the accession of the new ruler. On Calpurnius' use of *Ecl.* 4 see also 4.5–8, 76–77 (on which cf. Nauta (2002) 390).

¹⁰⁸ Cf. above, p. 312.

the sixth book of the *Aeneid*, where we read another prophecy of the Cumaean Sibyl. She foresees *horrida bella*, an *alius Achilles*, and the events of the Trojan war happening *iterum ... iterum* (ll. 86–94). This sounds very much like her prophecy in *Ecl.* 4, but refers to the wars that Aeneas will wage in Italy and that Virgil will describe in the second half of the *Aeneid*. And indeed, at the beginning of Book 7 of the *Aeneid* (and this is the third passage), *horrida bella* are announced as the theme (l. 41),¹⁰⁹ in combination with an evocation of *Ecl.* 4: *maior rerum mihi nascitur ordo, / maius opus moueo*, “a greater series of events is born for me, it is a greater work I set in motion” (*Aen.* 7.44–45), recalling the announcement of panegyric in *paulo maiora canamus* (*Ecl.* 4.1), as well as the beginning of the fulfillment of that announcement in *magnus ... nascitur ordo* (4.5). The nexus of intertextual references suggests that what follows in the *Aeneid* is panegyric of the wars of Aeneas (which would be in keeping with a common view of heroic epic as panegyric),¹¹⁰ and that these wars are in some sense to be identified with the wars of *Ecl.* 4. There the poet seemed to pray for life and breath enough to write the panegyric of the wars that would lead to the restoration of the Golden Age. Here it seems as if that panegyric is now to be realised in the *Aeneid*.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁹ Cf. above, n. 57.

¹¹⁰ Virgil himself attests to this view when he promises immortality to Nisus and Euryalus (*Aen.* 9.446–449; cf. 10.792–794, to Lausus). There is no strict distinction between the thought that epic immortalises its heroes and the thought that it praises them, because the concept of fame encompasses both. For Homer as a panegyric poet see e.g. Pind. *Pyth.* 3.112–115, *Isthm.* 4.37–42; Simon. *IEG* 11.13–18; Theocr. 16.48–57, 17.118, 22.215–220; Hor. *C.* 4.9.13–28 (similarly 4.8.20–24 on Ennius); the interrelations between these passages are discussed by Barchiesi (1996). Also pertinent is the tradition about Alexander’s envy of Achilles (Cic. *Arch.* 24, Plut. *Alex.* 15, etc.), as well as the role of Homer in *recusationes* (such as Hor. *C.* 1.6) and in the rhetorical theory of the encomium (e.g. Men. *Rhet.* 369.8–9, quoted by Cameron (1995) 273 and 465).

¹¹¹ A first version of this paper was presented in April 2003 at the conference “Uses and Abuses of Pastoral: Arcadia Re-visited”, organised in Oslo by Mathilde Skoie. I thank the participants on that enjoyable occasion for their comments. I also thank the editors of this volume for their careful reading of my manuscript.

TIME AND TEXTUALITY IN THE BOOK OF THE *ECLOGUES*

BRIAN W. BREED

To the degree that a book can be perfect, Virgil's *Eclogues* have defined perfection. In this case, perfection equates to formal polish, symmetry, and, above all else, a dominant impression of unity achieved from the coordination of apparently disparate parts.¹ It is the function of the perfect book, in other words, to take the ten separate eklogues, *eklogai*, "selections", and craft them into a singular, whole *liber bucolicon*.² To some readers, the intense poetic craft of the *Eclogues* has suggested a design of total completeness and even mystical significance. While not all have subscribed to such strong formulations, the history of the interpretation of the *Eclogues* is in no small part a history of responses to the unity of the book. At Rome, the *Eclogues* book set a precedent for formally polished poetic collections and, in the words of John Van Sickle, "immediately prompted a mode of reading appropriate to itself as a whole entity".³ In other words, with their own poetry books, Horace, Propertius, Tibullus, and Ovid inaugurated the tradition of the reception of the *Eclogues* as a unified book. History, however, has shown, if anything, the capacity of the perfect book to expose the imperfection of readers and of readings. It is fair to say that as yet no one ideal reader or ideal reading has emerged from the succession of efforts at describing the unity of the book.

The present discussion does not offer a new scheme to explain the "architecture", "design", or "structure" of the *Eclogues*. The prominence

¹ "The 'Liber Bucolicorum' is one of the few perfect books: each eclogue is enhanced somehow by its position—this effect was achieved, I have no doubt, by a certain amount of rewriting; and, taken together, the ten have an additional beauty and sense" (Clausen (1964) 193). See now Barchiesi (2005b) on perfection as a theme of scholarship on poetry books; my thanks to him for sharing his paper with me in advance of its publication.

² Cf. Van Sickle (1978) 9. On the title, see Perutelli (1995) 27–28. In polemical mode, Van Sickle (1995) 133 has counseled readers "to drop the tralatitious title '*Eclogues*' (never V.'s) and the load of trivial questions it drags along, so as to free energies for the fullness of V.'s imagination through commentary on *The Book of Bucolics*".

³ Van Sickle (1978) 10.

of architectural metaphors like these in descriptions of ancient poetry books reflects a shared desire among critics to comment on the book as a complete and whole entity. For that, the appeal to vision, traditionally regarded as the sense that apprehends wholeness and simultaneity,⁴ is fundamental to architectural metaphors. And, in fact, a visual approach extends beyond just critical vocabulary. The charts and graphs that often accompany discussions of the *Eclogues*—representing the numbers of lines in poems or subdivisions of poems, shared themes between poems, and other patterns of symmetry and responson—function as visual abstractions of the book, snapshots of it as it exists all in a single moment. With the simultaneity of vision, however, we can contrast reading as a process that has movement both across the physical space of the book and through time. And this at least, no matter how obvious, merits stating right up front: attested theatrical performances of the *Eclogues* notwithstanding, the perfection of the *Eclogues* as a book presupposes an audience of readers, readers of a particularly attentive and engaged sort. While the activity of reading, at least in its most familiar modern form, does involve vision, in the form of the eye's scanning of the page, even so, reading a book of poems is not particularly like looking at a building.⁵ For one thing, even the most assiduous reading does not, at least initially, apprehend wholeness and unity of the type that can be represented visually in a chart. Every reading might have unity and consolidation as its ultimate goal, whether that goal is acknowledged or not.⁶ But in the process of reading, the book of the *Eclogues* confronts the reader with an infinite number of ways in which it can be broken into pieces. To fall back on a familiar dichotomy, the diachronic experience of the *Eclogues* as a book is significantly different from the book taken in all its synchronic wholeness.

All poetic collections are characterized by the tension between diachronic diversity and synchronic unity. But in the case of the *Eclogues*, that tension has a particular generic relevance. In antiquity, pastoral, or bucolic, is a literary form found primarily in collections of short poems, that is in books. In this sense, pastoral contrasts itself with other genres, and with epic above all. As a collection of disparate parts a book

⁴ Cf., e.g., Fowler (1991) 29–30.

⁵ Anderson (1986) 53–55 likewise interrogates the metaphors of “architecture” and “structure” for their suggestion that the experience of reading is analogous to visual scanning of a building, although not all of his objections are equally valid.

⁶ Cf. Sharrock (2000), esp. 21–24.

of pastoral poems emphatically represents something other than an Aristotelian “single action”. But at the same time, a common strategy of critical response to the *Eclogues* is, as we will see, to find the unity of the book reflected in an over-arching narrative. That is to say, the physical unity of the book collection has encouraged reading for a plot or something like a plot in the *Eclogues*, a story to enfold the ten separate poems into a unity of theme, thought, or intention that can justify their presentation together within the same covers.⁷ The *Eclogues* make this reading strategy all the more attractive by virtue of, on the one hand, the deep interrelatedness between the poems in the book and, on the other hand, the avoidance of simple narrative continuity between them. Character names repeat regularly, but rather than a stable cast of characters all involved in one drama, the identity and the role of “Menalcas”, “Damoetas”, “Amaryllis”, and “Galatea” seem to change from poem to poem.⁸ Some principle of unity appears to be lurking in the collection, but it has to be found in something other than a dramatic model or Aristotelian canons of unity.

Dramatic unity is for other genres, especially epic, not pastoral. Defining the generic identity and the history of pastoral is in fact an important task the book of the *Eclogues* sets itself. Despite pastoral’s evocation of a naive performative tradition in its past, the literary genre would not exist without writing and without books. The reception of Theocritean bucolic through a book collection or collections by Virgil and by his post-Theocritean Greek predecessors had a crucial, if still somewhat mysterious, role to play in its development.⁹ There has even been speculation that the *Eclogues* imitate the physical layout, and not just the contents, of a Theocritean book.¹⁰ The book itself is thus a badge of the *Eclogues*’ generic identity. It also represents itself as a kind of history of the genre. With a programmatic opening and a conclusion that functions as Virgil’s farewell to pastoral, the book of *Eclogues* encourages its own reception as an account of the evolving

⁷ Miner (1986) describes what he calls the “plotless narratives” (p. 39) of poetic collections.

⁸ Cf. Krevans (1984) 335–336. As Papangelis describes elsewhere in this volume, the repetition of character names in the book may be less a device for dramatic unity and more a function of the pervasive fragmentation of the collection. At every stage, Prof. Papangelis’s very stimulating discussion of pastoral textuality in the *Eclogues* bears comparing with my comments in this chapter.

⁹ See Gutzwiller (1996a), Hunter (2002) 98–99.

¹⁰ Vaughn (1981). For another possible reconstruction of an authorially designed Theocritean poetry book, see Lawall (1967).

story of Roman pastoral itself from its first beginnings to its completion. In all these ways, the *Eclogues* express pastoral's deep generic affinity for books. But at the same time, pastoral takes as its defining fiction the oral, pre-textual world of shepherds. Orality and textuality in pastoral are not so much in opposition to one another as they are mutually dependent. The naive fiction, in fact, sets off and highlights all of the capabilities of textuality that are exploited by Virgil's writing. Pastoral practice might be oral and performative within the intimate communities of shepherd-singers that populate the landscapes of the *Eclogues*, but pastoral poetics depend upon writing, on books, and so, on readers.

And the community that readers form is, at best, a fractious one. Once the book has been entrusted to readers, it is difficult to imagine how any critical account could describe all of the diversity of what they might make of it. Absolute unity, whether sought in the text itself or in critical opinion about it, is simply out of reach. Reading itself, moreover, is not one single thing. Reading, rather, is a collection of different practices that are highly contextual and adaptable.¹¹ In Virgil's day, reading might include such distinct activities as reading aloud to oneself, hearing a recitation, having a text read to one, as well as silent visual scanning of the page.¹² And so, rather than seeking from the text of the *Eclogues* an approximation of one ideal reader or a perfect reading, our best hope lies in describing, to take a phrase from Don Fowler, the "interplay of possible readers".¹³

In the case of the *Eclogues*, possible readers are very much the same thing as possible readings and even possible books. The formal structures of the *Eclogues* book—the cross-references, the pairs of thematically related poems, the significant markings of beginnings, middles, and ends—look, on the one hand, like a kind of roadmap laid out by the text to guide its readers to a single, authorized interpretation. Those same structures, however, might, from a Fishian point of view, productively be considered readers' contributions to or impositions on the text.¹⁴ Or, as Alison Sharrock has recently put it, "unity ... is what

¹¹ Cf. recently Johnson (2000), who describes not only different forms of reading in antiquity but also how reading changes in different contexts and as part of different "reading events".

¹² For recent corrections to the old orthodoxy that silent reading was totally anomalous in antiquity, see Gavrilov (1997) and Burnyeat (1997).

¹³ Fowler (1995) 36.

¹⁴ Cf., e.g., Fish (1980) 105, as quoted by Fraistat (1986) 8.

we say about a text, not a feature of it".¹⁵ In their ability to impose unity, readers are also, in a sense, editors. Any reader of the *Eclogues* who determines that, for instance, the structure of the book is defined by pairings of thematically related poems has engaged in "a process of selection and arrangement".¹⁶ Even the famous numerological correspondences that seemingly hold out the promise of a transcendently objective marker of authorial design for the book are subject to a reader's editorial judgment. The determination of which numbers are, in fact, meaningful and where the thematic correspondences between poems lie creates structure as much as, or more than, it discovers or reveals structure.¹⁷ And that is true even when a numerological theory does not lead a reader to become an editor in a concrete sense and physically alter the text.¹⁸ The practice of such readerly activism provides a useful reminder that the formal patterns and symmetries of the *Eclogues* book might be less a hermeneutical key to unlock the ultimate design of authorial intent than a reader's tool to shape the text in accordance with his or her individual idea of its meaning.

In the present chapter, I first survey some previous approaches to the *Eclogues* as a book. I do not aim to provide a comprehensive overview.¹⁹ Instead I focus on the relationship as I see it between certain theories of structure in the *Eclogues* and the idea that the book generates something akin to a plot or a story. Such theories often base them-

¹⁵ Sharrock (2000) 21.

¹⁶ Fraistat (1986) 7: "the reader construing a book of poems, no less than the author constructing it, engages in a process of selection and arrangement".

¹⁷ Cf. Anderson (1986) 50–53 on the shortcomings of numerological theories; he points out, for example, that added together *Ecl.* 1 and 2 have 156 lines, the same number that results from adding *Ecl.* 6 and 7 together. If the numerological premise in its basic form holds, there ought then to be a thematic significance to those pairings, although Anderson himself cannot identify one.

¹⁸ Skutsch (1969) 156, for instance, deletes *Ecl.* 8.76 (and declines to insert the additional refrain editors sometimes add after line 28) in order to make his scheme of symmetry hold up. Maury (1944) 111–133 before him had been even more interventionist, finding a need for both addition (of three lines to *Ecl.* 3) and excision (of one line from *Ecl.* 7) in order to achieve symmetries built around the "Pythagorean" numbers 333 and 666. Brown (1963) 67–71 represents a kindred mathematical approach, accepting the deletion of *Ecl.* 7.19.

¹⁹ Rudd (1976) 119–144 and Van Sickle (1978) 17–37 provide much fuller coverage of previous descriptions of the *Eclogues* book. More generally, Hinds (1996) is very informative in a circumscribed space. Krevans (1984) remains a standard reference. From a perspective that extends beyond antiquity, Fraistat (ed.) (1986) provides a good introduction to critical principles for approaching poetry books.

selves in the reality of the *Eclogues* book as a physical object. An ancient bookroll had to be unrolled to be read. That “hard reality” imposes certain parameters on reading the *Eclogues*,²⁰ at least in terms of a historical reconstruction of what reading the *Eclogues* was like at the time of their composition. In particular, a bookroll encourages, even mandates, reading in order from beginning to end.²¹ Descriptions of the *Eclogues* book, therefore, tend to focus either on the linear, diachronic movement through the collection from beginning to end or, alternatively, on a synchronic view of the construction of the whole. As we will see, where the *Eclogues* reflect on their own written form, the linear experience of reading through the book in order is a prominent component of the definition of pastoral functions for textuality. But, at the same time, the intratextuality of the *Eclogues*, and especially the referentiality that binds poem to poem in the book, encourages styles of reading that are not exclusively linear and that even eschew attachment to the development of narrative. Textuality within the book of the *Eclogues* tends to bring, as we will see, not only narrative progress, but also fragmentation, deracination, and temporal dislocation. All of this is tied up with the *Eclogues*’ definition of pastoral’s generic identity. The book becomes not just a marker of the *Eclogues*’ pastoral character, but also a vehicle for generating a history of the genre of pastoral. But, here again, instead of a linear account of generic origins in the past, the *Eclogues* give their readers unordered fragments of different stories. In the end, we will see that for the *Eclogues* the book form is decidedly flexible with respect to such seemingly fixed entities as order, chronology, and story. Throughout this discussion, I have chosen to focus on the point of reception, where the construction of the *Eclogues* becomes the experience of a reader in time or becomes, rather, a number of possible experiences, which I now proceed to examine.

²⁰ Williams (1968) 480.

²¹ See in particular Van Sickle (1980a); cf. Zetzel (1980) 63: “the only significant chronology of a *liber* of this sort is that of unrolling the book: that we are to read the first poem before the second, the second before the third”.

1. *Do the Eclogues have a plot?*

In the words of Northrop Frye, “we *listen to* the poem as it moves from beginning to end, but as soon as the whole of it is in our minds at once we ‘see’ what it means”.²² For all its familiarity, the dichotomy between synchronic seeing and diachronic hearing still provides a useful hook on which to hang this brief survey of certain influential studies of the *Eclogues* book. Simultaneity and visual perception are both attributes of those studies that locate the meaning of the *Eclogues* in the unity of the book as a complete structure. In the diachronic alternative to these readings, an analogy with hearing can be found both in descriptions of meaning derived from change and development over time during a reading of the book and in a reliance on pastoral’s oral paradigms for understanding the relationships between parts of the collection.

Of contributions in the synchronic category, the most influential has been that of Otto Skutsch.²³ Skutsch defines the structure of the *Eclogues* book in terms of numerical and thematic symmetry between poems. He provides charts that are comprehensive in their attempt to represent not only the small three-, four-, and five-line units of structure that make up individual poems, but also the larger numerical symmetries between poems and groups of poems that bind the whole book together.²⁴ For Skutsch this structure exists, for the most part, for its own sake. He, in other words, considers the numerical patterns of the *Eclogues* not to be symbolic or otherwise endowed with significance, but rather to be essentially devoid of any attending story.²⁵ For that reason, all of the sense of the *Eclogues*’ structure can be taken in visually, at a glance. Skutsch’s particular account of the structure of the *Eclogues* modifies that of Paul Maury, who claimed to have discovered the “secret” of the *Eclogues* as a series of paired poems (1–9, 2–8, 3–7, 4–6) concentrically arranged in an ascending and descending triangle, with *Ecl.* 5 at the apex.²⁶ The resulting structure he compared to a “bucolic chapel” erected in honor of Daphnis, the pastoral god himself.²⁷ As with Skutsch, the structural scheme is made available for appreciation

²² Frye (1957) 77 (*italics original*).

²³ Skutsch (1969).

²⁴ Skutsch (1969) 154–155.

²⁵ Cf. esp. Skutsch (1969) 162.

²⁶ Maury (1944).

²⁷ Maury (1944) 99–100.

visually, both through the architectural metaphor and through charts. But for Maury, the static design does reveal an attendant story: the Daphnis of *Ecl.* 5 stands in for Julius Caesar honored, through allegory, as the new Roman god.²⁸ This reading perhaps represents, if anything, an overabundance of story, since Maury's thesis of a religious, even mystical, purpose to the collection was not widely taken up, even as his emphasis on the concentric pairs of poems has become commonplace.

The diachronic alternative to these static and visual abstractions of the book tends to be summarized in terms of "taking things as Virgil left them".²⁹ The primary emphasis, in other words, is placed on reading the poems in the order in which they appear in the book.³⁰ In practice, because of the absence of dramatic continuity from poem to poem, this leads to interpretations that suggest ways in which the order of the poems in the book is thematically significant. Thus, for instance, Jean Soubiran saw the order of the poems as aligning with progress through the four seasons, from spring to winter.³¹ An emphasis on progress, in different forms, is a key characteristic of linear readings. In what is without a doubt the most elaborate and subtle treatment of the book of *Eclogues*, Van Sickle's "linear-dynamic" approach focuses upon the "progressive growth of a positive ideological image", which culminates initially in *Ecl.* 4 and is then elaborated over the course of the rest of the book.³² In a recent treatment of the *Eclogues* book by Thomas Hubbard, progress takes generic form. For Hubbard, the sequence of the poems is focused on a conception of pastoral poetry itself that grows and develops across the book.³³ Hubbard in fact shows continuity with a long-established tradition of reading the book as generic history. The same general approach appears where, by a kind

²⁸ Maury (1944) 133–147.

²⁹ Van Sickle (1978) 80.

³⁰ There can really be no doubt that the order now is the order that Virgil left: Rudd (1976) 119–121.

³¹ Soubiran (1972).

³² Van Sickle (1978); the quote comes from p. 68. In a number of other publications (e.g., Van Sickle (1980b), Van Sickle (1984c)) Van Sickle has defended, restated, and elaborated the premises of his 1978 book, always starting from the fundamental thesis that the meaning of the *Eclogues* is found in "the book as a comprehensive and cumulative, coherent order" ((1978) 81). The 2004 reprint of Van Sickle (1978) contains a new introduction, in which the author offers his view of the place of the book with respect to subsequent scholarship: see pp. vii–xxxvi.

³³ Hubbard (1998) 45–139.

of “negative progression”, the *Eclogues* are thought to represent a plot in which pastoral or poetry itself becomes over the course of the book increasingly imperiled, futile, or unsatisfactory.³⁴

The synchronic and the linear approaches to the book represent not only contrasting “plots”; they also represent contrasting responses to the *Eclogues* book as a physical object. The concrete sense in which the book of poems is a single thing, folding all it contains into an overriding physical unity, underwrites the synchronic approach. By contrast, diachronic readings respond more to the book as an editorial collection of diverse parts that are revealed gradually and in linear order as the scroll is unwound. In either case, the order of the poems, as the most prominent way in which the physical book affects the reader’s experience, is the pre-eminent interpretative issue. Order, in fact, calls for interpretation in any poetic collection. In a book that actually brings together disparate material, such as a Hellenistic edition of Pindar or an anthology of epigrams like Meleager’s *Garland*, the order in which the editor chooses to present the poems exerts a potentially controlling influence on the reader’s experience.³⁵ The continuities or discontinuities that might characterize movement from one poem to another in a collection are heavily influenced by editorial choice. In the Hellenistic period, there is a range from order as a maximal contributor to the perception of unity in, say, Pindar’s epinicians, to the impression of looser connections and even disarray in the *Aetia*. Because the *Eclogues* were, no doubt, all composed and revised together, they represent an editorial collection only notionally. Nevertheless, to the extent that the text presents itself to readers as ten poems with ten separate beginnings and endings, it mimics a true collection in, among other things, the necessity of interpreting order. Both synchronic and linear approaches start from the order of the poems in the book. Both approaches, however, must be measured against other possible ways of defining order.

Historically, the physical book has not been the only, or even the dominant, manifestation of interpretable order with respect to the *Eclogues*. Many readers over the years have seen the primary challenge posed by the *Eclogues* book as one of reconstructing the order in which

³⁴ E.g., Putnam (1970), esp. 391–394, Solodow (1977), Boyle (1986) 15–35. The relationship of *Ecl.* 9 to 1 (and Theocr. *Id.* 7) is especially prominent in these descriptions; cf. Perkell (2001) 68–69 (the quotation comes from her p. 68).

³⁵ On epigram books in particular, see Gutzwiller (1998). The “new Posidippus” is adding much to the picture for the 3rd century BC.

the individual poems were composed. A compositional order provides another trajectory for reading the collection that runs in counterpoint to the editorial order of the poems as they appear in the book. Thus, for example, in a typical reconstruction of the order in which the first five poems were written, *Ecl.* 2 and 3 are the earliest. *Ecl.* 5 precedes 4, and *Ecl.* 1 is later than them all.³⁶ The book order, then, is conceived of as the product of a subsequent event: each of the historically independent eclogues was subjected to collection and editorial ordering after its composition. Read in the presumed order in which they were written, the poems tell different stories than emerge from the book order. That story might be, for instance, one of movement from more dependence on Theocritus to more independence as Virgil's poetic voice matured.³⁷ For his part, Brooks Otis believed that reading the *Eclogues* in their compositional order would also reveal Virgil's political biography during the time of writing the poems. The collection, for him, shows the poet's movement from skepticism to faith with respect to the Julian family.³⁸ The individual eclogues are, however, as Van Sickle for one has rightly insisted, so deeply intertwined that the compositional order is beyond recovery.³⁹ Nevertheless, the attempt to read the *Eclogues* in their compositional order has an enduring appeal.⁴⁰ That appeal can be attributed, at least in part, to the lack of dramatic and narrative continuity from poem to poem in the book. Linear movement through the physical book does not correspond to progress through time at the level of a story. By contrast, a reading that follows the compositional order at least enjoys a clear chronology, which can be made to correspond to a developing story.

And so the order of the collection is not an uncomplicated thing in the history of the interpretation of the *Eclogues* book, but is rather a locus for differentiating possible readers. Even the editorial or book order is, as a general principle of poetic books, not a simple thing.

³⁶ See Coleman (1977) 14–21, who arrives at a compositional order for the whole collection of 2, 3, 5, 4, 7, 8, 9, 1, 6, 10. Rudd (1976) 125–126 surveys more examples of proposed compositional orders, and there are still more in De Saint-Denis (1960) 3–6: “Autant de critiques, autant de systèmes” (p. 5 n. 2).

³⁷ On this principle *Ecl.* 2 and 3, being supposedly more imitative of Theocritus, are almost always placed first in reconstructions of the order of composition. Again, the discussion in Coleman (1977) 16–17 is representative. Van Sickle (1978) 17–18 does a good job of exposing the fallacies of such a theory.

³⁸ Otis (1964) 128–143.

³⁹ Van Sickle (1978) 24–27.

⁴⁰ Cf. most recently Seng (1999).

As much as the order in which the poems appear in the book directs a reader's progress, the placement of one poem next to another creates juxtapositions and resonances that will not mean the same thing to every reader. The order of a collection, which might look like a "hermeneutic straitjacket", is, in other words, in fact capable of "freeing the reader to pursue any number of interpretive paths".⁴¹ The *Eclogues* book plays out this paradox. On the one hand, the book restricts readers: the scroll and the editorial order of the poems on it impose a single linear trajectory on their experience. But at the same time, as we will see, the book itself provides readers with the tools to depart from, and even to deconstruct, those reading experiences. But before considering in detail how the *Eclogues* exploit their own textuality to open up interpretive possibilities that resist the linear trajectory of the physical book, it will first be necessary to look at how the *Eclogues* themselves acknowledge the physical reality of the book and a reader's movement through it. The linear trajectory of reading, in fact, has particular associations with pastoral for Virgil, and in the following section I discuss how this is reflected in the poems themselves. In particular, the book acknowledges the reader's experience where one poem gestures towards other poems that precede it in the book. This retrospective orientation of textuality makes the book an especially significant contributor to the *Eclogues*' construction of their own generic history.

2. *The physical book: reading and generic progress*

In acknowledging their own written form, the *Eclogues* show continuity with previous Hellenistic and neoteric poetic collections. Nothing in the *Eclogues* speaks quite as directly to the look and the feel of the book in the reader's hands as the gesture towards the sheen and smoothness of the *libellus* in Catullus 1. Nothing quite matches the *Aetia* narrator's appeal to the Graces to wipe their "lotioned hands" on his elegies to spark the reader's awareness of the concrete reality of the book as object.⁴² Still, the *Eclogues* do constantly gesture toward the book in which they appear. One way in which these poems reflect on their presence within the covers, so to speak, of a book is by explicitly projecting their audience as a reader. Lycoris in *Ecl.* 10 (l. 2), Apollo in *Ecl.* 6

⁴¹ Fraistat (1986) 10.

⁴² *Aet.* fr. 7.13–14 Pfeiffer = 9.13–14 Massimilla.

(ll. 11–12), and Pollio in *Ecl.* 3 (ll. 84–85) are all invoked as readers. As such, they bridge the gap between pastoral fictions and the real world, providing models for any and all of the *Eclogues*' actual readers. Another means the *Eclogues* use to acknowledge their written form is sign-posting. The collection features numerous references to the position of particular poems with respect to each other and to the book as a whole. Through this sign-posting, the collection reflects two fundamental traits of written language: embeddedness and retrospection. Writing is embedded in the sense that it has a physical location on an object, such as a tombstone, or the architrave of a building, or, as on a couple of notable occasions in the *Eclogues*, the bark of a tree. The sign-posting of the *Eclogues* is, in fact, one way in which this text asserts the potential of the book itself to stand in for other possible locations of textual embedding.⁴³ Writing is retrospective in the sense that every written sign bears witness to a previous event of inscription.⁴⁴ The retrospective aspect of writing in the *Eclogues* is further expressed where the text casts itself as a transcription, a secondary event and a record of what someone previously said.⁴⁵ At the same time, sign-posting in the collection also asserts the retrospective orientation of textuality by asking readers, as a corollary of their forward movement through the book, also “to look back and reflect, to estimate change”.⁴⁶

It is especially the major structural points of the sequence of ten poems that makes up the book—the beginning, middle, and end—that are sign-posted in this way. And it is the ends that are the most marked. The first word of *Ecl.* 10 is “last”: *extremum hunc, Arethusa, mihi concede laborem*, “Arethusa, grant me this last effort”, an explicit reference to the place of the poem in the sequence.⁴⁷ While *extremum ... laborem* could conceivably be a reference to a final stage in the compositional history of the *Eclogues*, the poem is concretely last from the perspective of a reader. In a comparable way, lines near the conclusion of *Ecl.* 5—at the

⁴³ Textual embeddedness, especially as a feature of books in relationship to performance, occasion, and voice, has recently been receiving much attention with respect to Horace: see Lowrie (2002), Barchiesi (2000), and Habinek (1998) 109–114.

⁴⁴ Cf. Walter Ong's essay “*Maranatha: Death and Life in the Text of the Book*” (Ong (1977) 230–271).

⁴⁵ Cf., e.g., *Ecl.* 2.4–5, 7.1–20, 10.70–74.

⁴⁶ Van Sickle (1978) 80–81, according to whom such retrospection is a fundamental step in the reader's progress towards interpretation of the book.

⁴⁷ Cf. Van Sickle (1978) 189.

juncture between the two halves of the ten-poem sequence—also align with the reader's experience of the book. They mark *Ecl.* 5 as explicitly after other poems that readers have already encountered (ll. 85–87):

Me. *hac te nos fragili donabimus ante cicuta;*
haec nos "formosum Corydon ardebat Alexin",
haec eadem docuit, "cuium pecus? an Meliboei?"

(Menalcas) I will first make you a gift of this fragile pipe. It taught me "Corydon burned for handsome Alexis"; the same one taught me "Whose herd? Is it Meliboeus'?"

Menalcas' near quotation of the opening lines of *Ecl.* 2 and *Ecl.* 3 as two of his own prior compositions subsumes within the fiction of *Ecl.* 5 a past which coincides with the experience of reading through the book of *Eclogues* in order.⁴⁸ Even the quotation of the first lines of *Ecl.* 2 and 3 as something like titles reflects a convention of organizing and referring to the contents of books.⁴⁹ Menalcas looks back on his own compositions as if they were written, which aligns with the way the reader's experience of the book gives the past concrete reality as a text. And so, in both of these places the text acknowledges its embeddedness while also acknowledging a reader's progress through the book's sequence with retrospective glances at where he has been.

Not surprisingly, retrospection is also the dominant note at the close of the book. The last eight lines of *Ecl.* 10 function both as a conclusion to that poem and as a coda to the collection as a whole (ll. 70–77).⁵⁰

haec sat erit, diuiae, uestrum cecinisse poetam,
dum sedet et gracili fiscellam textit hibisco,
Pierides: uos haec facietis maxima Gallo,
Gallo, cuius amor tantum mihi crescit in horas
quantum uere nouo uiridis se subicit alnus.
surgamus: solet esse grauis cantantibus umbra,
iuniperi grauis umbra; nocent et frugibus umbrae.
ite domum saturae, uenit Hesperus, ite capellae.

This will be enough, Pierian goddesses, for your poet to have sung while he sat and wove a basket from slender hibiscus; you will make it great for Gallus, Gallus, for whom hour by hour my love grows as much as a

⁴⁸ Cf. Van Sickle (1978) 81–84. Elsewhere in this volume (p. 284) Philip Hardie rightly refers to the densely metapoetic pipe as "a symbol of the bucolic tradition".

⁴⁹ Cf. Van Sickle (1978) 213.

⁵⁰ For discussion see, for instance, Putnam (1970) 386–390, Krevans (1984) 340–342, Rumpf (1996) 177–200.

green alder throws itself up in the new spring. Let us rise: the shade is accustomed to be harmful to singers, the shade is harmful to the juniper, shadows also hurt the fruits. Go home well fed, Hesperus comes, go my goats.

The images of closure here include references to passing time, specifically the coming of the end of day (evening shadows, Hesperus), and references to departure and movement through space (rising, going home). The metaphorical field of closure thus mimics a reader's experience of the book: the reader has been moving through time and through the space of the text. At the same time echoes of other eclogues, and in particular the first, draw the work together and inscribe a further retrospective note at the end of the collection. The reader who is thus encouraged to reflect on her own experience of the ten poems she has just finished reading might well be left with a final impression of an Aristotelian unity of beginning, middle, and end. This is an effect encouraged by the way allusions articulate the major structural points in the book in terms of analogies with other books.⁵¹ *Ecl.* 10 thus marks the end not only of the physical book but also of the reader's movement through it.

Embedding and retrospection provide the *Eclogues* book with the infrastructure for a plot. The chronological consistency of the signposting references in the *Eclogues* makes for a kind of pseudo-dramatic continuity that corresponds to a reader's awareness of the position of the poems in the book and of his progress through it in order. The opening lines of *Ecl.* 4, which also explicitly advertise the position of the poem in a sequence, contribute further to the sense of reading as progress. But in doing so, these lines in particular suggest that along with the progress of reading, there is also progress in the development of a story. It is a story, apparently, of generic change and growth (ll. 1–3):

Sicelides Musae, paulo maiora canamus!
non omnis arbusta iuvant humilesque myricae;
si canimus siluas, siluae sint consule dignae.

Sicilian Muses, let's sing something a little grander! Trees and lowly tamarisks are not to everyone's taste; if we sing of forests, let them be forests worthy of a consul.

⁵¹ The beginning (*Ecl.* 1.1–5) alludes to Theocr. *Id.* 1 as the programmatic opening of a Theocritean collection. The “proem in the middle” of *Ecl.* 6 alludes to the proem of the *Aetia*, and the end of *Ecl.* 10 echoes the Callimachean “epilogue” (fr. 112 Pf.).

The conventional wisdom sees in *arbusta ... humilesque myricae* a reference generally to the diminished status and humble themes of pastoral, and specifically to *Ecl.* 1–3 as manifestations of those themes.⁵² The reference to the book is, therefore, once again retrospective. And by professing to sing *paulo maiora*, the speaker characterizes the relationship of the poem to what has preceded it as explicitly one of advancement. Progress is seemingly marked in specifically stylistic and generic terms. *Humiles* (l. 2) taps a standard term of literary evaluation in antiquity, and tamarisks, *myricae*, are, for what it is worth, a shrub that receives a rare mention in Theocritus. Thus movement forward through the book is in this case also movement up, from more humble themes, and perhaps more Theocritean ones, to (slightly) more elevated ones.

Textual retrospection oriented towards generic progress insures the embedding of *Ecl.* 4 in the book, and so guarantees what has been a fundamental interpretative issue: how it relates to the rest of the book. But at the same time, *Ecl.* 4 also mimics a performance and seems, more than any other eclogue, to take place at a specific historical moment in time outside the book (ll. 4–7):

*ultima Cumaei uenit iam carminis aetas;
magnus ab integro saeculorum nascitur ordo.
iam redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna,
iam noua progenies caelo demittitur alto.*

The final age of Cumaean prophecy now has come; the great order of ages is born anew. Now returns the Virgin, the kingdom of Saturn returns, now a new race is sent down from high heaven.

The putative occasion referenced by this emphatic *iam ... iam ... iam* has been a matter of much speculation.⁵³ At the same time, through the force of textual embedding the poem's vivid "now" can be construed as referring to a moment not in history, but in the reading process. It carries a sense of "here, at this point in the book of *Eclogues*". The fiction of performance in this case only enhances embeddedness.⁵⁴ As a rule, acknowledgements of textuality in the *Eclogues* are never far from fictions of performance.

⁵² For discussion see, e.g., Van Sickle (1978) 61–63, 132.

⁵³ For a thorough discussion of the historical setting of the poem, see Du Quesnay (1977) 25–43, who argues again that the poem commemorates the marriage of Octavia and Antony following the pact of Brundisium.

⁵⁴ Cf. Barchiesi (2000) for some of the comparable complexities of performance and occasion that are evoked by the *Odes*.

For the *Eclogues* oral performance and reading in fact represent alternative venues in which the static, atemporal text can become diachronic. Just as reading is a process that proceeds through time, song performance is accompanied by explicit description of passing time on several occasions in the *Eclogues*. In *Ecl.* 8, for instance, Damon's song marks progress from a beginning to an end through its use of refrains: *incipi Maenaios mecum, mea tibia, uersus*, "my pipe, with me begin the Maenalian verses" (ll. 21, 25, etc.) and *desine Maenaios, iam desine, tibia, uersus*, "end, pipe, now end the Maenalian verses" (l. 61).⁵⁵ In *Ecl.* 2 Corydon sings from midday (ll. 8–13) to dusk (ll. 66–68), and in *Ecl.* 6 the song of the prodigious Silenus lasts "from the satyr's awakening till night-fall" (ll. 85–86).⁵⁶ In all of these cases, there is an alignment between the performance being represented and the time that passes while the poem is read, even if the duration of time is quite different for the performance and for the reading. But even without such direct models, a turn to comparisons with orality can be hard to resist when describing what happens during the diachronic experience of reading. Frye is representative when he characterizes forward progress through a poem as akin to listening to it. But in the *Eclogues*, and in pastoral generally, the place where reading and hearing would seem to align most directly is the verbal exchange of oral dialogue. And this is especially true of the pastoral amoebean contest.

3. Amoebean contests and the plot of the book: responsion and progress

In its traditional form, a pastoral amoebean contest proceeds as one participant in the singing exchange matches, or, preferably, surpasses, what he hears from his partner.⁵⁷ Amoebean, in other words, models linearity and progress, but associates them with a notional orality. The fiction is that the exchanges are not only oral, but extemporized. When reading one of the amoebean *Eclogues*, progress across the page matches

⁵⁵ Damon's refrain directly imitates the refrain in Thyrsis' Daphnis song in Theocritus' *Id.* 1 not just dictionally and formally, but also in function; cf. Hunter (1999) 61: "the three refrains which punctuate the song of Thyrsis chart the move from 'beginning' to 'repetition' ... and ultimately to 'cessation'. Thyrsis' song inaugurates and completes a whole genre".

⁵⁶ Coleman (1977) on *Ecl.* 6.82.

⁵⁷ For representative attempts to codify the rules for amoebean competition, see Gow (1952) vol. 2, 92–94, Powell (1976) 115–116, Clausen (1994) 89–92.

progress that is a matter of speaking and listening in real time. And in the *Eclogues*, amoebean represents a comparandum for the larger structures of the book and for literary history. But it also shows how those analogies are limited and where the textuality of the book departs from oral paradigms.

As explicitly represented in the lead-in to the contest between Thyrsis and Corydon in *Ecl.* 7, the mechanisms of amoebean pastoral are order, alternation, and responsion (ll. 18–20):

*alternis igitur contendere uersibus ambo
coepere, alternos Musae meminisse uolebant.
hos Corydon, illos referebat in ordine Thyrsis.*

Therefore the two of them began to compete with alternating verses; the Muses wanted to remember the alternations. Corydon produced some and Thyrsis others that followed in order.

Corydon is the leading singer. At each stage Thyrsis then must formulate a response that closely answers what he hears from Corydon.⁵⁸ The requirement of responsiveness from Thyrsis in and of itself insures that there will be progress, even if merely at the mechanical level. But I choose to highlight *Ecl.* 7 because in at least one exchange something more is happening. Corydon sings a song of seduction to Galatea (ll. 37–40):

*Nerine Galatea, thymo mihi dulcior Hyblae,
candidior cygnis, hedera formosior alba,
cum primum pasti repetent praesepia tauri,
si qua tui Corydonis habet te cura, uenito.*

Galatea, Nereus' daughter, sweeter to me than the thyme of Hybla, whiter than swans, lovelier than pale ivy, as soon as your bulls are fed and return to their pens, if any care for your Corydon grips you, come.

In his response to this, Thyrsis imitates the voice of Galatea herself, expressing her eagerness for a rendezvous at the end of the day (ll. 41–44):

*Immo ego Sardoniis uidear tibi amarior herbis,
horridior rusco, proiecta uilior alga,
si mihi non haec lux toto iam longior anno est.
ite domum pasti, si quis pudor, ite iuueni.*

⁵⁸ The give-and-take between amoebean competitors in this poem has been subjected to much analysis, usually with the goal of determining why it is Corydon who is ultimately declared the winner in the contest; see, e.g., Pöschl (1964) 93–154, Fantazzi and Querbach (1985).

I would rather seem to you more bitter than Sardinian grass, rougher than butcher's broom, more worthless than washed-up seaweed, if this day is not now longer to me than a whole year. Eat and go home, if you have any shame, go bullocks.

This exchange represents a particularly pronounced sort of linear progress for the amoebean contest. Even if Thyrsis' reply is meant to be ironic,⁵⁹ there is also progress at the level of a story. The amoebean contest here is approaching drama.

This is not the only example of an amoebean exchange that represents the creation of a dramatic story in performance, even if only for a moment. In *Ecl.* 3.76–79, for example, Damoetas addresses Iollas, and Menalcas subsequently responds as Iollas.⁶⁰ And other types of dramatic or quasi-dramatic continuity also appear in the amoebean poems. For example, in *Ecl.* 7.45–52 two quatrains exchanged by Corydon and Thyrsis represent changing seasons, first summer, then winter; then in a second pair of quatrains, flourishing spring (7.53–56) is followed by late-summer blight (7.57–60). In this case, the story that develops is enacted concretely in terms of the passing of time. In some sense the story *is* the passing of time. In an example to which we will return, a continuous story also emerges from the song exchange in *Ecl.* 5. Mopsus first sings about the death of Daphnis (5.20–44). Menalcas follows and continues the story to Daphnis' apotheosis (5.56–80).

In whatever form, these continuous stories bring out the linear element in the amoebean contest with particular force through the complete alignment between the progress of a performance, the movement of reading, and the development of a story.⁶¹ Such continuous stories, however, are not generally representative of amoebean exchanges. It is more often the case that the continuity from one contestant's contribution to another is not dramatic. Rather, "*amoebaean* poems ... rarely involve any substantive engagement at the level of content—

⁵⁹ As it is taken by, e.g., Clausen (1994) on ll. 41–44.

⁶⁰ The ultimate model for both this passage and *Ecl.* 7.37–44 is Theocritus' *Id.* 6, in which Daphnis addresses Polyphemus in his song and Damoetas responds as Polyphemus. Cf. also *Ecl.* 7.29–32 (with Conington's notes) in which Corydon takes on the role of "Micon".

⁶¹ In the case of *Ecl.* 7 it should be mentioned that forward progress is also the progress of narrative, as the amoebean contest between Thyrsis and Corydon is in fact presented through the diegetic frame of Meliboeus.

engagement is rather primarily formal, in terms of rhetorical organisation and sentence structure".⁶² But whether progress is strictly formal or properly dramatic, it nevertheless matches the forward movement of reading through the poem. For one thing, in the amoebean contest, chronology clearly defines the relationship between parts. In this respect, the pastoral amoebean contest asserts itself as a model for literary history; in both, what comes later in time follows, responds to, and perhaps builds upon what precedes.⁶³ The contest might also represent a model for the diachronic experience of reading the book of *Eclogues*, which is in some sense a matter of determining the relationship of poems in the book to each other in light of their order.

The principle of amoebean responson has, in fact, been invoked both as a force to create dramatic development between poems in the book and as an overriding metaphor to explain its construction. Otis, for one, described the relationship between Maury's matched pairs of eclogues in terms of "balance", "correspondence", "reciprocity", "contrast".⁶⁴ This is the language of amoebean form, and in Otis's scheme a story develops as in each pair a more positive poem answers, and corrects, a more pessimistic one. In construing these pairs of poems, Otis departs from the chronology of the poems as they appear in the book. In each pair, he in fact reads the one that appears in the first half of the book as notionally later than the corresponding poem in the second half. Thus *Ecl.* 4 reverses *Ecl.* 6's narrative of moral decline. *Ecl.* 1 is the more optimistic palinode to the darker *Ecl.* 9. *Ecl.* 5 "transforms death and sterile disorder into new life and peaceful innocence" and as such is both the centerpiece of the responsive pairs of poems and a response itself to *Ecl.* 10.⁶⁵ Otis's re-ordering of the collection into these amoebean pairs stems, it seems, from a need to make the book tell a positive, one might say "optimistic", story.⁶⁶

But the amoebean principle can also underwrite descriptions of a developing story that work in tandem with the order of the book. Van

⁶² Martindale (1997) 120.

⁶³ Among recent discussions that explicitly make this point see, for instance, Farrell (1992a), Alpers (1996) 86, Hardie (1998) 17, Hubbard (1998) 68–75, 86–99.

⁶⁴ Otis (1964) 128–143. For Otis there is an overall binarism to the collection, which he divides into halves: the "forward looking" *Ecl.* 1–5 and *Ecl.* 6–10 which are "concerned with the past" (130).

⁶⁵ Otis (1964) 142.

⁶⁶ Cf. in particular Otis (1964) 131–132 on the relationship of *Ed.* 1 to 9.

Sickle, for example, construes the book's intricate cross-references as analogous to the dictional similarities of amoebean responses. Thus, for instance, the very last line of the book, *ite domum saturae, uenit Hesperus, ite capellae*, "go home well fed, Hesperus comes, go my goats" (*Ecl.* 10.77), closely resembles a line of the first *Eclogue*: *ite meae, felix quondam pecus, ite capellae*, "go on my goats, once happy flock, go on" (1.74). We can say that *Ecl.* 10 "responds to" *Ecl.* 1. And in this case, the position of the poems in the book does align with the time of the implied relationship between them. In the first poem Meliboeus is addressing his no longer fortunate flock as he and they are headed into exile. In *Ecl.* 10, Meliboeus' words are taken up by the narrator when he addresses his satisfied flock as they are headed home. Van Sickle highlights this particular cross-reference as confirmation that "the book may be conceived as a single and organic work, in which something changes for the better between the beginning and the end".⁶⁷ With that Van Sickle succeeds where Otis had failed, in making the book order tell an optimistic story.

The interplay of Van Sickle and Otis as possible readers of the *Eclogues* book prompts general reflections on the nature of the book in terms of order, plot, and chronology. Otis does not feel bound by the chronology of the poems as they appear in the book in construing the relationship between them. By contrast, Van Sickle has been among the staunchest advocates of the proposition that the only way to read an ancient book is linear, as determined by the physical form of the book as it existed at the time of composition. In some sense finding a unified story in the linear movement through the book is the greater challenge, as evidenced by the very intricacy of Van Sickle's analysis. And yet the discontinuities that are as much a fact of the *Eclogues* book as the unities which Van Sickle describes with such rhetorical force might lead one to question whether progress through the book must in fact be matched by continuous development on the level of a story. Even the amoebean contest does not completely model progress in every case. As much as development and growth at times characterize these exchanges, simple repetition is also an element of the amoebean contest. The second utterance in an amoebean exchange must change something from the first, but change need not extend beyond language itself. That is to say,

⁶⁷ Van Sickle (1978) 73. For Van Sickle's version of the amoebean model as a principle of the book, based, like Otis's, around responsive halves and pairs of poems, see pp. 213–214.

change and movement forward in time and in reading would at times seem not to signal progress, just change and change alone.⁶⁸

Without a doubt, a linear trajectory characterizes both the amoebean contest in which one song follows, answers, and, in certain cases at least, builds upon another and the reading process, which is guided from beginning to end by the physical form of the book. But at the same time, this linearity is very much in tension with the inclination readers may have to double-back, skip ahead, and otherwise read against the imposed order of the collection. Because of the lack of simple dramatic continuity in the *Eclogues*, it is, somewhat paradoxically, perhaps critics who are looking for unity who above all others must circle back, re-read, and jump around in the book to find what they are looking for. It simply cannot be said that the collection mandates one type of reading to the total exclusion of all others. The tension between the book as a collection of diverse parts and as an overriding unity gives rise to the interplay of possible readers and conflicting approaches to chronology, to the relationship between parts of the collection, and in general to the generic expectations of pastoral when it comes to reading. Van Sickle's "linear-dynamic" style of reading puts a premium on dramatic developments and progress as a component of the genre.⁶⁹ The schemes of Maury and Skutsch, labeled "concentric-static" by Van Sickle, equally represent a theory of pastoral; rather than development and change, it is the aesthetic completion and final arrangement of the book which are productive of meaning. In a way that is allied with these approaches, but more critically self-conscious, other readers such as Paul Alpers, Charles Segal, and Michael Putnam have prioritized "suspension" as an effect of the *Eclogues*. Pastoral for these critics is not, or not always, essentially dramatic, but neither is its suspension accompanied necessarily by stability. The poetry instead maintains oppositions in ways that at times defy or deliberately avoid resolution.⁷⁰ It is not an exaggeration to say that every theory of how the book ought to be read is, in some sense,

⁶⁸ Thyrsis' response to Corydon in *Ecl.* 7.61–68 might provide a good example.

⁶⁹ See, in particular, Van Sickle (1978) 80–81 (reading that is not strictly linear, but combines forward progress with retrospection and reappraisal), and cf. pp. 116–118 on method (reconstructing reading through the eyes of ancient readers).

⁷⁰ Cf. Alpers (1979) 96–105, following Segal (1965) 243–244 and Putnam (1975) on the end of *Ecl.* 1; cf. also Perkell (1990) 45–47 on "inconclusiveness", Jenkyns (1998) 185 on "unstable equilibrium" characterizing the ends of several *Eclogues*, and Hardie (1998) 26–27.

also a theory of pastoral itself. And central to pastoral's definition of its own generic parameters for reading is a contrast with other genres.

4. *Constructing unity*

Heroic epic in particular stands out as the genre against which pastoral defines itself, whether in subject-matter or in ambition or in how it valorizes different strategies for reading.⁷¹ The pastoral book as a collection of diverse parts is central to the contrast with epic. Kathryn Gutzwiller has argued that diversity of matter, form, and style is the essential implication of the term *eidyllion* that appears frequently in the Theocritus scholia. The Greek suggests "short poems of different types" (εἰδη), and Gutzwiller believes that the term arose to describe the contents of an early, perhaps even 3rd-cent., collection of Theocritus' poems.⁷² Whether that is true or not, it would seem that the need to balance continuity and discontinuity that characterizes Virgil's book of *Eclogues* is not new to the genre, but is as old as the oldest pastoral books and their generic confrontation with epic. In the ancient world, to define reading as a process that follows one straight line to a predetermined end reflects, above all else, the prestige of epic.⁷³ The interrelatedness between poems in the *Eclogues* book is, in fact, as deep as possible while avoiding the epic feature of narrative continuity.⁷⁴ The *Eclogues*, like other ancient poetry books, replace epic narrative continuity and orientation towards achieving a *telos* with formal and thematic *varietas* within the parameters of the book.⁷⁵

While epic derives a presumptive unity from the singular figure of the epic narrator, one way in which the *varietas* of the *Eclogues* expresses itself is in the alternation between the three *genera narrationis* that Plato's Socrates defined in the *Republic* and that early on showed their utility to

⁷¹ See in general Halperin (1983a), Van Sickle (1975), and Van Sickle (1976).

⁷² Gutzwiller (1996a) 129–133; the quote comes from p. 130; cf. Gow (1952) vol. 1, lxxii. By contrast, Fantuzzi (*Der Neue Pauly*, s.v. "Eidyllion") is skeptical that the term can provide any insight into an original, or even pre-Virgilian, conception of bucolic.

⁷³ See Sharrock (2000) 33–35.

⁷⁴ Krevans (1984) 350; this is the conclusion of her section on the *Eclogues* (pp. 327–350).

⁷⁵ For such *varietas* as a predominant principle of arrangement for not just the *Eclogues*, but other Roman poetry books as well, see Anderson (1986) 45–49.

commentators on pastoral.⁷⁶ Under this scheme, the voice of the poet represents the singular source for representation throughout the work, whether speaking directly (*diegesis*), remaining hidden “behind” imitations of speaking characters (*mimesis*), or mixing the two modes. The identification, or the construction rather, of such a single speaker or author figure is a common function of how readers perceive or create unity for an apparently diverse collection.⁷⁷ For the *Eclogues* this commonly means attributing an essential unity to the authorial voices that frame pastoral fictions in *Ecl.* 2, 8, and 10, and to the narrators of *Ecl.* 4 and 6, whether this voice is strictly identified with the historical Virgil or not. The same voice, then, can function as the implied authorial presence behind the dramatic mimesis of *Ecl.* 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9. In fact, as I lay it out here, this scheme of alternation between unframed, odd-numbered dramatic poems, and even-numbered, framed or narrative poems is one of the oldest ways of describing the architecture of the book.⁷⁸ But when this theory is put into practice, it encounters the significant slippage of authorial roles from poem to poem in the *Eclogues*. Thus the Tityrus of *Ecl.* 1 returns in the role of the “author” of *Ecl.* 6. Or, at least, the framing speaker of *Ecl.* 6, who does authorial things like discussing poetics, reflecting on the position of the poem in the book, and addressing a patron, is called “Tityrus” (l. 4). The authorial ego of *Ecl.* 7 carries the name of Meliboeus (l. 9), Tityrus’ interlocutor from *Ecl.* 1. These two poems in particular, with their fictionalized narrators, disrupt the alternation between *mimesis* and *diegesis* that otherwise seems to follow the order of the poems in the book.⁷⁹ The end of *Ecl.* 5 provides a particularly complicated example of the mixing of the roles of authors and characters. Menalcas’ quotation of the first lines of *Ecl.* 2 and 3 as, apparently, his own prior compositions goes farther than just about anything else in the *Eclogues* in crafting the unity of the book. And yet, the cross-reference enforces a re-reading of the collection that challenges the presumed unity of the authorial presence across the book.

⁷⁶ Plato, *Resp.* 392c–394b; cf. Σ in *Theocr.*, *Prolegom.* D and *Anecdoton Est.* III.6 (pp. 4, 11 Wendel), Serv. *ad Ecl.* 3.1; see, e.g., Schmidt (1972) 45–57.

⁷⁷ See Fraistat (1986) 11–12 on poetic collections received as veiled autobiography and poetic self-presentation: “we are wont to synthesize the subjects, themes, tonalities, and genres of a contexture into the preoccupations and perspectives of a ‘speaker’ (present or implied) who is responsible for them all” (p. 11); cf. Gutzwiller (1998) 10–12 on the role of books in the developing consciousness of authorship with respect to Hellenistic epigram.

⁷⁸ Cf. Rudd (1976) 126–129.

⁷⁹ As Van Sickle (1978) 19–20 has rightly emphasized.

In the movement between author and character roles over the course of the *Eclogues* book an opening emerges even for non-identity between the anonymous authorial voices represented in the framing passages to *Ecl.* 2, 8, and 10. It becomes impossible to answer the question of who, in personal terms, “speaks” these passages. The default assumption would be that these passages represent the voice of the author himself, or at least some single figure of generic unity analogous to the “Homer” described by Socrates, whom we might call “the Eclogue Poet” or “the singer of the *Eclogues*”.⁸⁰ But the naming of the framing voices of *Ecl.* 6 and 7 as Tityrus and Meliboeus suggests a model closer perhaps to a variorum collection of epigrams or even a collected edition of bucolics by Theocritus and Theocritean imitators than to the authorial singularity of the *Iliad* or of a collection of Pindar or Sappho.⁸¹ And if we turn to criteria other than personal identity for classifying these framing speeches, such as their generic affiliations and referential make up, unity is again elusive. The panegyric speaker of *Ecl.* 8, for instance, whose intertexts include non-pastoral Theocritus, Aratus, and Homer, seems especially distant from the authorial persona sketched at the conclusion of *Ecl.* 10, tending his sheep and ostentatiously plaiting his basket of art for art’s sake. The framing speaker of *Ecl.* 2, alluding both to Callimachean narrative and to Meleager’s epigrams,⁸² has a very different generic profile from the narrator of *Ecl.* 4, who, by any standard, has to be considered a special case for the book on account of his tenuous pastoral affiliations.

In the fluidity of the author function in the book, the *Eclogues* problematize the assumption that all of their representations proceed from the same, singular source. On the one hand, a book as a collection of poems might be an apparatus that encourages the identification of some such authorial persona as the locus of unity. But it also can produce just the opposite effect. For the *Eclogues*, the book in fact becomes

⁸⁰ With, respectively, Leach (1974) 245–276 and Alpers (1979). Cf. Van Sickle (1978) 74: “it seems reasonable to interpret the type of the goatherd–narrator–singer as a figure of unity and development in the book as a whole, the initiating element or protagonist in poetic imagination, and mediator between the bucolic and larger modes”.

⁸¹ The diversity of the Hellenistic and neoteric landscape with respect to types of poetic books and the complicated variety of book consumers’ interventions in shaping that landscape are emphasized by Barchiesi (2005b) in the name of freeing the study of Roman poetry books from their dependence on authorial design as the one interpretative principle that crowds out all others.

⁸² With *Ecl.* 2.1–5 cf. *Aet.* fr. 67.1–3 Pf. and *AP* 12.127 = *HE* 4420ff.

a vehicle for diffusing the authorial presence. This is a function of textuality, that, while hardly unique to the *Eclogues*,⁸³ has a particular association with Virgil's pastoral world. There, instead of a poetics based on authorship, readers encounter "the collectivity of poetic activity".⁸⁴ How, in the absence of a singular authorial voice and of a simple narrative, the competing claims of unity and diversity play out and are redressed in readings of the *Eclogues* specifically as pastoral is the subject of the following section.

5. *The intratextual book*

The necessity of considering the diverse ways in which parts relate to wholes must, as Alison Sharrock has recently insisted, figure at the heart of any working definition of what is a potential feature of any book, intratextuality.⁸⁵ A. Sharrock and Helen Morales's recent collection clearly attests to the absence of consensus about what exactly intratextuality is.⁸⁶ But much as the term intertextuality has come to be identified with relationships between texts that cannot be fully explained in terms of traditional literary-historical categories such as influence, borrowing, and imitation, intratextuality is a fluid concept that offers a positive evaluation of analogous features within a work. These include fragmentation, digressions, inconsistencies, and the like.⁸⁷ As a phenomenon of the *Eclogues* book, intratextuality takes account of all the different trajectories along which reading might proceed alongside and outside of the strictly linear parameters that are imposed by the physical book or by a drive to construct a single, unified narrative or narrative voice from it. The relationship of time to textuality is a particularly important aspect of the intratextuality of the *Eclogues*, and it is on that relationship that I concentrate here. Where the forward chronology of reading or of narrative meets the retrospective orientation of writing, Virgil's pastoral exploits temporally flexible functions of textuality as a force to disrupt linear narratives. The *Eclogues* do so, I contend,

⁸³ See, for instance, Zetzel (1980) on Hor. *Sat.* 1; meanwhile, Gowers (2003) has brought the Horatian autobiographical poetic *ego* of the *Satires* back for new analysis.

⁸⁴ Goldberg (1986) 58, whose view of pastoral, expressed in this instance with respect to *The Shepherd's Calendar*, descends directly from Alpers (1979) on the *Eclogues*.

⁸⁵ Sharrock (2000) 4.

⁸⁶ Sharrock and Morales (2000).

⁸⁷ See Sharrock (2000) 1–7, and generally.

with an eye in particular on possible narratives of generic history and origins.

Virgil's pastoral, as a new genre at Rome, is at pains to define, and if necessary create, the tradition in which it comes. The *liber bucolicon* is essential to that project of tradition formation as the venue for narratives of the history of pastoral. And yet in the Hellenistic and neoteric poetics to which Virgil is inheritor in the *Eclogues*, intertextuality often plays off the diachronic orientation of literary history, allowing authors to avoid the negative consequences of being secondary or "belated". In an allied way, the book of *Eclogues* creates its own miniature literary history. Or, rather, through a variety of forces that might all be grouped under the rubric of intratextuality, the book of the *Eclogues* creates its own versions of literary history. As we have seen, sign-posting at various points in the sequence of poems acknowledges the bookroll as physical object and the diachronic experience of reading through it. In other words, poems later in the book include those that precede as part of their history. At the same time, the book also features a number of self-conscious disruptions of chronology, where progress in reading through the book encounters not progress in the development or growth of a narrative or story, but temporal dislocation and even confusion. Such disruptions have their own generic orientation. The history of pastoral is, in fact, constantly being made and remade over the course of the book.

In literary history, allusion is an essential marker of temporal position. And in this context I use "allusion", and not another term, advisedly. Allusion is a diachronic figure. It ascribes to the words on the page a history, a relationship to the past. The past in this sense is represented by other texts; a later text *alludes to* an earlier one. Allusion, therefore, is inherently historical and retrospective.⁸⁸ In the *Eclogues*, each of the cross-references that define the interrelatedness of the collection is a kind of allusion internal to the book. And to the extent that the cross-references are analogous to allusions, we look for a clear temporal relationship between the referring text and the target text. And, in fact, the physical book does define earlier and later in a concrete way: the relative position of poems on the scroll imposes chronology on them. But, at the same time, any number of cross-references in the *Eclogues* book allow for no clear chronology at the level of story or, in fact, consciously

⁸⁸ In general, cf. Hinds (1998) 52–98, "Diachrony: literary history and its narratives".

react against the chronological order imposed by the physical book. For that reason, the linear experience of the book as it is read comes into conflict with other ways of construing time.

Thus, for instance, shared language links the sixth *Eclogue* to the first and creates what is perhaps the best known of the *Eclogues*' self-references. In *Ecl.* 1, Meliboeus says to Tityrus "you are meditating the forest muse on a slender straw" (*siluestrem tenui Musam meditaris auena*, l. 2). Similar language appears in *Ecl.* 6: *nunc ego ... agrestem tenui meditabor harundine Musam*, "now I will meditate the country muse on a slender reed" (ll. 6–8). In the latter passage, it is Tityrus speaking, characterizing his own new poetic program in the wake of Apollo's intervention to prevent him from singing about "kings and battles" (*reges et proelia*, l. 3). The referential relationship between these two passages has long been seen as central to construing the unity of the book.⁸⁹ The cross-reference seems to imply, however, a chronology that is at odds with the location of the two poems on the scroll. The future tense *meditabor* (l. 8) in *Ecl.* 6 would locate Tityrus' encounter with Apollo at some point in time prior to his appearance meditating his muse, present tense, in *Ecl.* 1 (*meditaris*, l. 2). *Ecl.* 6, the poem that appears later in the book, thus plays the role of "prequel" to *Ecl.* 1. Hence the ancient speculation that, in fact, *Ecl.* 6, and not *Ecl.* 1, is really the first of the bucolics.⁹⁰

The apparent muddying of the chronological waters might not amount to much, but for the burden this particular self-reference carries for the *Eclogues*' definition of their own history. To a certain degree the story of the formation of Tityrus' literary program is the story of the creation of Roman pastoral itself.⁹¹ But, in fact, *Ecl.* 1 and 6 offer contrasting, perhaps even incompatible, versions of Tityrus' personal literary history. It is, at best, difficult to combine them into a single, unified narrative. The cross-references between *Ecl.* 1 and 6 somehow link the encounter with Cynthian Apollo (6.1–8), which leads to a changed poetic program, and the encounter related in *Ecl.* 1.40–45 with the *deus iuuenis* at Rome, who instructs the boys to carry on *ut ante*, "as before" (l. 45) and allows Tityrus to play what he likes (ll. 6–10). In the mix of models for pastoral's history—the aesthetic canons of the Callimachean *recusatio*, divine commissions and political patronage, the

⁸⁹ For discussion, see, e.g., Van Sickle (1978) 88–89.

⁹⁰ *Serv. proem. ad Buc.* 3.19–20 Thilo, taken over from Donatus: cf. Perutelli (1995) 31.

⁹¹ Cf. Breed (2000).

stages of Tityrus' career moving from pastoral to epic and back again—there is no simple narrative of generic origins described. Tityrus is most certainly denied the simplicity of the myth represented elsewhere in the collection of pastoral as a matter of direct, linear succession from god to man and from one master to another.⁹² In the midst of these different versions of the origins of pastoral, the construction of a coherent story from the fragments of history which the book presents is dependent on a reader's inclination or disinclination to piece them together.

As the common denominator of all of the *Eclogues*' glimpses of pastoral's past, Theocritean imitation would seem to provide the poems with their pre-eminent aetiological myth. Thus, in the singing contest that is literary history, Virgil plays amoebean respondent to Theocritus' lead, and from that Roman pastoral is born. But even this version of pastoral history is subject to reconfiguration within the book of *Eclogues*. Another prequel in fact challenges the sense of order not only within the book but also in literary history. *Ecl.* 10 balances its position last in the series of ten *Eclogues* with a suggestion that it might be the earliest of them all. Lines 4–6, as Van Sickle has suggested, locate the dramatic present of the poem before Arethusa leaves the Peloponnese for Sicily:

*sic tibi, cum fluctus subterlabere Sicanos,
Doris amara suam non intermisceat undam,
incipi, eqs.*

When you glide beneath the Sicilian waves, may bitter Doris not mingle her wave with yours; begin, etc.

“In other words, Virgil has imagined his last effort in bucolic as pre-Sicilian, hence pre-Theocritean”: by this Van Sickle understands *Ecl.* 10 to be aligning itself with the creation of a myth of Arcadian pastoral origins in *Ecl.* 4.⁹³ At the same time, the arch irony of a text dependent on Theocritus, at the conclusion of a book dependent on Theocritus, claiming temporal priority to Theocritus represents a strategy of avoiding belatedness. Strict linear chronology is doubly rejected as the only trajectory along which reading and interpretation can proceed, whether for Virgil's relationship to Theocritus or for one part of the *Eclogues* book's relationship to another. The conjunction of temporal disruption through intertextuality and through intratextuality might

⁹² *Ecl.* 2.31–39, 5.85–87, 6.64–73; on heredity as a version of pastoral history, see Van Sickle (1978) 127, (1980a) 25–26, Hubbard (1998).

⁹³ Van Sickle (1978) 189–191, the quote comes from p. 190.

in fact leave the reader with the impression that the poems are not “in order” at all. Thus neither the model of amoebean response and progress nor the model of epic teleology strictly applies to Virgil’s project of tradition formation for pastoral. In their place, one can start to see the coming together of a distinctly pastoral model of textuality.

6. *Pastoral textuality*

While the pastoral world is, for the most part, oral, pastoral poetry is on many levels impossible without writing and books. And the intertextuality, intratextuality, and resistance to linear chronology that characterize the *Eclogues*’ complicated generic history are directly associated with the *Eclogues*’ self-conscious exploitation of writing as the medium of the reader’s experience. The juxtaposition of the orality of pastoral fictions and the textuality of pastoral poetics allows the *Eclogues* to highlight certain properties of writing in comparison with speech. Embedded writing, for one thing, occupies a physical place in a way that speech does not. Given a concrete location, writing also possesses a durability that evanescent speech does not. But at the same time, by virtue of their very embeddedness and durability, written words have a mobility in both time and space that spoken words do not. If speech always takes place in a moment, writing is subject to relocation.

Where written texts appear in the oral pastoral world of the *Eclogues* they have tended to be seen as disruptive.⁹⁴ But at the same time, the very rarity of reading and writing in the pastoral world gives their manifestation added force as an analogy for the experience of a reader of the *liber bucolicon*.⁹⁵ One manifestation of writing given particular prominence in the *Eclogues* is inscription. In *Ecl.* 5.42–44, a sepulchral epigram honors Daphnis:

... *tumulo superaddite carmen:*
“Daphnis ego in silvis, hinc usque ad sidera notus,
formosi pecoris custos, formosior ipse”.

⁹⁴ Cf., e.g., Hubbard (1998) 136–137; Putnam (1970) 373: “in the bucolic world, which relies on memory for its song, the idea of writing is suspect”; also 169, writing is “a practice repugnant or at least foreign to the shepherd’s oral art”.

⁹⁵ Cf. Hardie (1998) 17: the presence of writing in the pastoral world is a marker that the text is “concerned with the making of poetry in the real world”.

... crown his tomb with a song: "I am that Daphnis known in the forests, known all the way to the stars, keeper of a handsome herd, more handsome myself".

This pastoral inscription takes the spoken claims to undying fame made by Theocritus' Daphnis (cf. Theocr. 1.120–121) and by Odysseus (cf. Homer, *Od.* 9.19–20) and in effect vouches for their truthfulness, guaranteeing their survival by entrusting them to physical text just as Theocritus and Homer had already done. Here the temporal durability of writing is exploited as a vehicle for commemoration. But if that sort of stability is one function of writing, the allusions in these lines point also to writing as a vehicle for displacement and relocation; the words of Homer and Theocritus are physically "transposed", to use Julia Kristeva's term, into Virgil's text and onto Daphnis' tombstone. Similarly, in *Ecl.* 10, Gallus' professed intention to inscribe his *amores*, that is, his love affairs and his love poems, on the trees (ll. 52–54) represents relocation in various forms. On the assumption that there are allusions to poems by Gallus in these lines, Gallus' own words are transposed in time (from when he previously wrote them to their appearance in *Ecl.* 10), in space (from the text of Gallus' book to Virgil's, as well as from wherever he set them to Arcadia, and physically onto that tree), and, presumably, in genre (from elegy to pastoral). *Versus translati* indeed; the famous dictum of Servius is more correct than he would ever have recognized.⁹⁶ As such these verses are a broad model for the intertextuality and intratextuality of the *Eclogues*.

There is in *Ecl.* 5 a further elaboration of the idea of text as inscription. The poem in fact dramatizes a confrontation between the linear progress of a continuous narrative and textuality's potential for temporal displacement as a conflict between oral song and written text.⁹⁷ In their exchange of songs, Mopsus sings first of the death of Daphnis, and then Menalcas sings of his deification. Although Mopsus and Menalcas give two solo performances, the relationship between their songs accords with the expectation of the amoebean contest for responsiveness. Responsiveness in this case leads to the development of a continuous story—from death to afterlife. In adapting amoebean, pastoral's

⁹⁶ *Hi autem omnes versus Galli sunt, de ipsius translati carminibus*, "these, however, are all verses of Gallus, taken over from his poems" (Serv. *ad Ecl.* 10.46).

⁹⁷ I have discussed this aspect of *Ecl.* 5 at greater length in a paper forthcoming in M. Skoie and S. Velázquez (eds.), *Pastoral and the Humanities: Arcadia Re-inscribed*.

definitive form, *Ecl.* 5 represents, for the *Eclogues* book, what looks like the ultimate pastoral story. On any account, this poem is the structural keystone of the book; it is either the centerpiece of the concentric schemes of Maury and others, or it is a turning point for a linear reading such as Van Sickle's. Moreover, *Ecl.* 5 is also an epitome of generic history. In Theocritus' *Id.* 1 singing about Daphnis is the first act in the creation of pastoral.⁹⁸ Singing about Daphnis in *Ecl.* 5 thus represents a generic aetiology, a renewal of the first pastoral act. That renewal, however, is doubly mediated through writing: not only is a song about Daphnis represented by Virgil's text, writing is also employed within the fiction by at least one of the Daphnis singers. Mopsus' and Menalcas' songs are not in fact extemporized on the amoebean model. Both have a previous history prior to their performance, and Mopsus' song has a history specifically as a written text (ll. 13–15):⁹⁹

immo haec, in uiridi nuper quae cortice fagi
carmina descripsi et modulans alterna notavi,
experiar, eqs.

No, instead I will try this song, which I recently wrote out on the green bark of a beech, noting the alternations as I played, etc.

In this case writing is exploited precisely for its flexibility with respect to time. Despite the appearance of amoebean responsiveness and a clear linear story, because Mopsus' song has a previous history as a written text it is not possible to tell in simple terms whether his or Menalcas' song in fact comes first. When Mopsus says that he has previously heard Stimichon praise Menalcas' Daphnis song (ll. 54–55), he might be signaling that he has modeled his own song on it.¹⁰⁰ But even if that is the case, his imitation takes the form of a prequel that, in performance, makes Menalcas' song look like the belated amoebean response. Within the fiction of *Ecl.* 5, one might thus find an analogy for the *Eclogues* in their own refusal to be belated by their chronologically subordinate status to Theocritus. In *Ecl.* 5 the retrospective nature of writing is thus oriented towards generic history, but in opposition to linear literary-historical chronology.

A final example of the retrospection that is the defining force of textuality in the *Eclogues* comes from *Ecl.* 9. Given the poem's position

⁹⁸ Cf. Hunter (1999) 60–61.

⁹⁹ For the parallel history of Menalcas' song, see ll. 50–55.

¹⁰⁰ So Clausen (1994) 151–152.

near the end of the collection, it cannot help but refer to what has come before. And, since Servius at least, the particular relationship of *Ecl.* 9 to 1 has been crucial for determining the overall direction of the book, whether, in other terms, the *Eclogues* tell an “optimistic” or a “pessimistic” story.¹⁰¹ How readers understand the chronology of the poems is central to this. Does *Ecl.* 9’s dark vision of banishment and threatened violence in the pastoral world represent a renewal of the dangers from which Tityrus at least, if not Meliboeus, has gotten release in *Ecl.* 1? A reference to passing time within *Ecl.* 9 would seem to reflect a dramatic moment later than *Ecl.* 1: the “old beeches, their canopy now shattered” (*ueteres, iam fracta cacumina, fagos, Ecl.* 9.9) could represent the result of violence inflicted on “the protective shade of a beech” (*tegmine fagi, Ecl.* 1.1) that Tityrus formerly enjoyed. If the book order and the dramatic order of the two poems coincide, pessimistic conclusions are hard to resist, as evidenced, for one thing, in the steps readers have taken to avoid them. To that end, the favored alternative is to take *Ecl.* 9 as reflecting the earlier moment, the dark days before Tityrus gained his salvation and/or before Virgil gained his. So Otis, for one, would have it.¹⁰²

If to see *Ecl.* 9 as dramatically later than *Ecl.* 1 is to be faced with an unpalatably pessimistic story, even more problematic is the retrospective relationship to the book evoked by the poetic fragments that are incorporated into *Ecl.* 9 in the form of snatches of remembered song shared between the two herdsmen Lycidas and Moeris. These fragments provide glimpses of a pastoral tradition greater than what is actually dramatized in the *Eclogues* book, while they also recapitulate previous poems in the book and previous poems by Theocritus. Thus, for example, *Ecl.* 9.46–50 reflect, not directly but in an “allusive” way, the songs in honor of Daphnis in *Ecl.* 5. A fragment of a song in honor of Varus on the theme of Mantua’s hypothetical escape from the land confiscations (9.27–29) evokes *Ecl.* 6’s abortive epic in honor of the same man (cf. 6.3–8). Lines 39–43 of *Ecl.* 9 corresponds very closely to, are even a translation from, Theocritus’ *Id.* 11, but they

¹⁰¹ Cf. now Perkell (2001).

¹⁰² Otis (1964) 131–132. For his part, Servius (*proem. ad Buc.* 2.24–3.14 Thilo) needed *Ecl.* 9 to represent a moment in time later than *Ecl.* 1, so that the book order would also be the dramatic order of the poems. But he also needed the book to have a happy ending. He, therefore, relied on a story of two Virgilian evictions: Tityrus in *Ecl.* 1 voices the poet’s initial gratitude for his restored farm, but *Ecl.* 9 then represents a subsequent, and blessedly successful, appeal for renewed help from the authorities.

also allude, to use that term, to *Ecl.* 7.37–40, where Corydon sings a song of invitation to Galatea. From there it is not far to see a connection to the entirety of *Ecl.* 2, Corydon's song of seduction to Alexis cum long-form version of Theocritus' Cyclops poem. In each case, memory, as the vehicle for the incorporation of these bits of other poems, creates a diachronic relationship between *Ecl.* 9 and the rest of the book. Lycidas' and Moeris' memories of the songs they previously heard performed mimic the reader's familiarity with poems he or she has already encountered in the book. And so, in some sense, the incorporation of these fragments into the fiction of *Ecl.* 9 represents a re-reading of the book.

Re-reading is a critical necessity; critical synthesis does not emerge fully formed from a first, naive reading of any text.¹⁰³ And re-reading might not just mean reading again, but also reading backwards. Van Sickle even posits the act of physically rewinding the scroll back to its starting point as the necessary opportunity for the elaborate structures that support his version of synthesis in the *Eclogues* to reveal themselves.¹⁰⁴ *Ecl.* 9, however, associates re-reading not with consolidation and synthesis. In this case, textual retrospection brings with it confusion, misattribution, and dislocation.¹⁰⁵ Within the fiction of *Ecl.* 9, incomplete, disrupted, and failed attempts at communication are associated with oral transmission: the characters in the poem have difficulty remembering and reproducing what they have previously heard (cf. ll. 26, 37–38, 44–45). For the reader of *Ecl.* 9, however, the references to previous poems in the book and to Theocritus make the same gaps and aporias a concrete matter of textual relocation. And in the process of transposition, not only have previous poems been reduced to incomplete fragments, but also such interpretative desiderata as the identity of the speaker in each fragment and the moment in dramatic time have become lost. Who is telling Tityrus to mind the goats while he goes to pay a call on Amaryllis (ll. 23–25)? Is it Menalcas? Moeris? One or the

¹⁰³ Cf. Barbara Herrnstein Smith's concept of "retrospective patterning" (Smith (1968) 119), as described by Fraistat (1986) 8.

¹⁰⁴ Van Sickle (1980a) 6. This hypothesis would be greatly challenged if there is anything to the (confessedly idiosyncratic) suggestion of Kenyon (1951) 61 that the practice of labeling and titling works at their conclusions suggests that scrolls were left rolled up after a reading.

¹⁰⁵ Cf., for one, Hubbard (1998) 120–124; he lists "confusion of characters, conflation of source texts and imitations, attribution of motives, and allegorical interpretation" (p. 124) as among the offshoots of the "systematic misremembering" and "revisionary misprision" (p. 124) that is *Ecl.* 9's relationship to the rest of the book.

other of them imitating the voice of a character? When did somebody tell Daphnis to admire the *sidus Iulium* (ll. 46–50)? Was it before or after Daphnis himself died and was honored in suggestively Caesarian terms in *Ecl.* 5? We have, in other words, no continuous story within which to place these fragments and we do not even have a sure chronology on which to construct one. Textuality in this case is less a matter of the secure embedding of the written word in a physical place than of the deracination of language through the capacity of text for dislocation and relocation.¹⁰⁶

7. *Conclusion: haec necdum perfecta*

In contrast to the “not yet finished” fragments of *Ecl.* 9, the book of the *Eclogues* is undeniably whole. But for all of its elegant completeness, perfection even, the book of the *Eclogues* is also a kind of machine to generate perceptions of diversity, even fragmentation, alongside the perception of unity. The question is whether it is then possible to imagine some account of the *Eclogues* book that would represent the infinite possible variety of combination and recombination of its constituent motifs, cross-references, internal allusions, and fragments of history. Even if we can imagine such a representation, it would, to be sure, not much resemble the static unity conveyed, for example, by Skutsch’s charts. As a roadmap that does not dictate a single line from first reading to critical synthesis, but in fact frees the reader to explore divergent interpretive possibilities, the *Eclogues* resist the reduction of meaning to a synchronic picture. But at the same time, the act of reading is itself possessed of an inherent “drive to unity”.¹⁰⁷ Even if the intratextuality of the book of *Eclogues* confuses chronology, every reading—by which I mean both the act itself and the critical enterprise, including this one—is a “linearization” that imposes chronology and order.¹⁰⁸ In other words, the diachronic order of the poems as they appear in the book is not the only alternative to synchronic, architectural unity as a way of understanding how the parts of the book relate to each other

¹⁰⁶ With this paragraph in particular, cf. the approach of Papanghelis elsewhere in this volume to the allied forces of textualization and fragmentation in the *Eclogues*.

¹⁰⁷ Sharrock (2000) 22.

¹⁰⁸ For the term, cf. Fowler (1991) 29; for reading as a journey that requires an Ariadne’s thread of singular direction, cf. Sharrock (2000) 20.

and to the whole. Rather, every reading and re-reading in some sense reorders, edits, and plots the book. For that very reason, the story any reader constructs out of the *Eclogues* is going to be radically individual because of, not despite, the book form.

One thing that gives Virgil's pastoral its oomph is the confrontation it enacts between an oral culture (the world of shepherds it represents) and the textuality required to make those representations. Although pastoral's defining fictions depend upon naive orality, the *Eclogues* use that orality not to idealize the presence and immediacy that no written text can ever possess, but as a way to reflect on the experience of the reader *qua* reader.¹⁰⁹ From what has proceeded I hope it is clear that for the *Eclogues* the written text functions not simply as the inert medium through which readers gain access to something else. The book, rather, is the essence of what readers' experiences of language in the *Eclogues* is, in all of its complexity, its availability for reordering and relocation, and even its disarray.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Fowler (1997), esp. 268–269, who reaches similar conclusions regarding the orality/textuality contrast in the *Aen*.

¹¹⁰ My thanks to A. Barchiesi and to M. Fantuzzi for their helpful comments on drafts of this chapter. T.D. Papangelis has further improved it both in his role as editor and by generously sharing with me his own work, for which I thank him.

FRIENDS, FOES, FRAMES AND FRAGMENTS: TEXTUALITY IN VIRGIL'S *ECLOGUES*

THEODORE D. PAPANGHELIS

1. *Competitive authorisations*

Ecl. 1 presents two shepherds differently affected by politics in the late 40s. Meliboeus has fallen victim to the land expropriations designed to accommodate Octavian's veterans; Tityrus has been granted permission by a Rome-based young man to stay on and pursue both work and play. Of the two characters, it is certainly Tityrus who has had a real brush with life's practicalities. Before settling for the reassuringly accommodating Amaryllis, he unwisely allowed spendthrift Galatea to play fast and loose with the strings of his *peculium* purse and thus scupper his *libertas*, which he eventually obtained when he had already started going grey.¹ His emerging CV evidences a sense of layered past and a perception of elapsing time we do not normally associate with pastoral characters;² and he is further exceptional among pastoral figures in that he has sought an appointment with the political authorities responsible for the land policies, and has had first-hand experi-

¹ On Tityrus' *libertas* see Clausen (1994) 31–32.

² Generally speaking, time in pastoral is thought to be important only in so far as it marks the boundaries of the singing activity, and the crucial midday hour seems to suspend time along with pastoral practicalities. It may be useful to recall here Bakhtin's concept of the "chronotope", especially as formulated with reference to Greek romance (see Winkler (2002) 29: "in this kind of time, nothing changes ... an individual can be nothing other than completely passive, completely unchanging ... to such an individual things can merely happen"). This is clearly not the case of Tityrus. The latter's sense of time may be of a rather practical and utilitarian nature, yet in itself and also by contrast with Meliboeus' rival temporality it shows that the question of time in the *Eclogues*, under its various aspects, is not to be restricted to *Ecl.* 4, as Jenkyns (1998) 199 would seem to believe. His view is at variance with one of my main lines of argument here, so let it be quoted in full: "Virgil's epic is pervaded by a fascination with the sense of time, history and process, concerns which we might not expect to meet in his earliest poetry; yet they are to be found already in an unlikely place, the fourth *Eclogue*". Note the more or less explicit distrust of the *Eclogues*' capacity to tackle such issues as "time, history and process". On this see also Hardie, this volume, pp. 293–298.

ence of the urban space *par excellence*, Rome, “always already an especially time-laden space”, particularly “responsive to the movements of time, plot and history”.³ Indeed, in a sense, Tityrus’ out journey may be said to repeat Rome’s own progression from rustic past (innocence) to urban present (wealth, power)—a recurrent theme, in both historical and poetic narratives, charged with an acute sense of temporality as well as moral ambivalence. Tityrus’ record thus seems to provide an explanation for his understanding that the new lease of life given his pastoral existence is part of a new political settlement, itself an event in historical time presided over by an authority that has nothing to do with his pastoral past.⁴

By contrast, Meliboeus’ past up to the moment disaster struck seems too uneventfully pastoral to merit special mention, and it is easy to see him as the antithesis of Tityrus’ adaptability to historical time and change.⁵ Despite his strong deprecation of civil war and its fallout, he appears to be singularly unequal to the emergency that undoes his way of life. And yet, as Paul Alpers among others has remarked, for many readers he comes to dominate the poem, not only emotionally but also formally, especially by what one might see as a collector’s piece of pastoralism, namely the *μακαρισμός* of 1.46–58.⁶ However, general praise of the lyrical quality of these verses will not do justice to the passage as a calculated and subtle response to Tityrus’ song and dance about the new political authority that grants the pastoral leisure and play memorably captured in 1.1–5, also spoken by Meliboeus. Lines 46–58 lend themselves to a stronger reading.

They come just after the dispensation of l. 45, *pascite ut ante boues, pueri, summittite tauros*, “graze cattle as before, my children, and yoke bulls”:

³ See Edwards (1996) 11, 28. Alpers (1996) 24–25 comments on time in connection with the way the two characters are represented in the poem, and makes the difference between Tityrus’ “sense of real time” and Meliboeus’ “timeless present” part of a broader disjunction suggested by the *Eclogue* between a “realistic” and an “idyllic” version of pastoral. Cf. Alpers (1979) 72.

⁴ Tityrus is fully aware of the quality and extent of his debt, perhaps even of its paradoxical nature, as *ludere quae uellem* (l. 10) suggests.

⁵ Although Meliboeus stands against a background of general disorder that affects, among other things, georgic labour, a distinction between a pastoral Tityrus and a georgic Meliboeus (on which see Van Sickle (1978) 52–54) is hardly tenable. The former’s *rura* (l. 46) are practically indistinguishable from his more strictly pastoral enclosure, and the latter’s posture in ll. 75–78 could hardly be more emblematically pastoral.

⁶ Alpers (1979) 67.

*fortunate senex, ergo tua rura manebunt
et tibi magna satis, quamvis lapis omnia nudus
limosque palus obducat pascua iunco:
non insueta grauis temptabunt pabula fetas,
nec mala uicini pecoris contagia laedent.
Fortunate senex, hic inter flumina nota
et fontis sacros frigus captabis opacum ;
hinc tibi, quae semper, uicino ab limite saepes
Hyblaeis apibus florem depasta salicti
saepe leui somnum suadebit inire susurro;
hinc alta sub rupe canet frondator ad auras,
nec tamen interea raucae, tua cura, palumbes
nec gemere aëria cessabit turtur ab ulmo.*

Lucky old man, the land then will remain your own, and large enough for you, although bare rock and bog with muddy rushes covers all the pasturage: no unaccustomed feed will try your breeding ewes, and no infection harm them from a neighbour's flock. Lucky old man, among familiar rivers here and sacred springs you'll angle for the cooling shade; the hedge this side, along your neighbour's boundary, its willow flowers as ever feeding Hybla bees, will often whisper you persuasively to sleep; the pruner under that high bluff will sing to the breeze, nor yet meanwhile will cooing pigeons, your own brood, nor turtledove be slow to moan from the airy elm.⁷

On the face of it, *ergo* marks the causal link between the words of the "god" and Tityrus' guaranteed bliss. Yet if Meliboeus is really convinced of such a link, it is slightly strange that he should never be anything but cool about this "god": on first hearing of him (*O Meliboeus, deus nobis haec otia fecit*, "Oh, Meliboeus, a god has made this leisure ours", l. 6), he has only a single-line question to spare (*sed tamen iste deus qui sit, da, Tityre, nobis*, "but give us that god of yours: who is he, Tityrus?", l. 18)—and that after airing his real concern about the maternity of his indisposed she-goat (ll. 12–17). Readers who complain of lack of real dramatic responsion in the exchanges of *Ecl.* 1 may well feel that *ergo* in l. 46 does not adequately address their concerns;⁸ and here this may be because ll. 46–58, rather than directly responding to Tityrus' version of who authorises pastoral song, seems to skip the

⁷ All *Eclogues* passages are quoted in the translation of Guy Lee.

⁸ Discussion of the dramatic interaction, or lack thereof, between the two characters has been linked to the question of the poem's mode: is it lyric or dramatic—or suspended between the two? See Alpers (1979) 69–71. Van Sickle (1984a) 111–115 makes some good remarks on the close dramatic relation of the speeches in the first half of the eclogue.

question of the cause (a question whose importance could hardly be overestimated under the circumstances) in order to concentrate on the effects. Unless, of course, the effects, as worded by Meliboeus, hold the clue to the (real) cause.

One might do worse than follow up the lead of *nota* (l. 51). It qualifies *flumina* but its force seems to play over the whole of the setting evoked by Meliboeus. That this setting, with its cool streams, is “familiar” to Tityrus goes without saying; yet *nota* may be reflexively nodding to all those familiar with the Theocritean intertext,⁹ as *nosco*, *agnosco* and the like are often cast in the role of reflexive annotations that “trope allusion as recognition”.¹⁰ Does Meliboeus see Tityrus as, above all, the beneficiary of continuities vouched for by a familiar tradition of texts that, with Theocritus at its centre, reaches as far back as the *locus amoenus* of the Platonic *Phaedrus* and Homer’s green spots beyond? And does Meliboeus, who in 1.1–5 had condensed an archaeology of Tityrus’ piping complete with Theocritean beginnings, myths of origin and Lucretian cultural narratives,¹¹ continue here to subtly instruct Tityrus

⁹ Beside the general setting outlined in *Id.* 5.45–49 and, especially, 7.133–146, note ὕδατος ψυχρῶ κρᾶναι δύο, “two springs of cold water” (*Id.* 5.47) and τὸ δ’ ἐγγύθεν ἱερὸν ὕδωρ, “and the sacred water nearby” (*Id.* 7.136) in particular, and also ποτὶ ταῖς παραῖσι, “near the springs” (*Id.* 1.2). But cool, shady and sacred brooks also feature in the *locus amoenus* of the Platonic *Phaedrus* (229a–230c), on whose significance for bucolic poetry see Hunter (1999) 14.

¹⁰ Hinds (1998) 1–16, esp. 8–10. *nota* has a knack of smoothly integrating hotspots of intertextual negotiation into narrative plot as in *Aen.* 3.657 (... *et litora nota petentem*, “seeking the shores familiar to him”), where Achaemenides’ Cyclops, utterly blind in the wake of Odysseus’ visitation, can still safely find his way to the familiar shore—familiar because during his long generic career, from Homeric epic through Philoxenus of Cythera’s dithyramb, Attic Comedy and satyr play to Theocritean and other Hellenistic poetic narratives, he spent there hours on end serenading Galatea, tending his sheep and, on that fateful day, raging against the departing Odysseus. For literary readers this was Sicily’s most familiar shore, made definitely the “Polyphemus beach” ever since Theocr. *Id.* 11 presented the melodious youth struggling in vain against the impossible odds of an unresponsive sea nymph, his pre-scripted Homeric destiny and the ironical exigencies of future reflexivity (see Hunter (1999) 217). As Barchiesi (2001a) 118 remarks, “allusions always focus on individual models but, to some extent, every allusive text makes also some broader allusive statement: ‘I am poetry’, or ‘fiction’, or ‘I belong to a tradition’”. *litora nota* in *Aen.* 3.657, much like *flumina nota* in *Ecl.* 1.51, alludes to the whole “tradition” of individual passages that have made this particular spot so familiar.

¹¹ On Lucretius’ contribution to tradition formation and generic self-fashioning in *Ecl.* 1 see Breed (2000), a well-argued and illuminating paper despite its underestimation of Meliboeus’ central role in the poem. Van Sickle (2000) in a closely-argued and stimulating paper wants to trace yet more intertexts behind the new foundation myth promoted by Virgil in *Ecl.* 1. My view of what Tityrus and Meliboeus stand for in

on what it takes to fashion and inhabit a pastoral genre? If so, his account leaves little room for political “upstarts” who put themselves forward as pastoral sponsors. *nota* points to something too intrinsic to admit of Tityrus’ much-vaunted extrapastoral authorisation; and it is by no means the only word to claim the distinction of reflexive annotation hereabouts.

Thus *semper* (l. 53) suggests a boundary hedge of willows originating in an undefined past and set to persist into an equally undefined future. Since temporal adverbs like *semper* have been known to make good reflexive markers,¹² the hedge is also asserting its textual (and intertextual) persistence as an equivalent of the αἶμασαι that feature in Theocr. 1.47, 5.93 and 7.22;¹³ nor does it come as a surprise to find it swarming with the household-name variety of Hyblaeen bees.¹⁴ Further, *suadebit* (l. 55) pushes the idea of continuity forward into an unconditional future. In fact, the whole of Meliboeus’ μαχαρισμός is cast in future tense (*manebunt, temptabunt, laedent, captabis, canet, nec cessabit*), with *saepe* and *nec cessabit* contributing a particular sense of repeatability.¹⁵

Ecl. 1 is obviously different from that of both Van Sickle (2000) and Hubbard (1998) 48–54, who make little of the fact that the programmatically crucial opening lines (1–5) are spoken by Meliboeus and are presented as part of *his* construction of pastoral experience.

¹² See Wills (1996) 31.

¹³ There is, properly speaking, no hedge in *Id.* 7.135–142, yet Virgil’s *saepes* looks very much like the result of a rearrangement that combines the earlier occurrence of αἶμασαι in *Id.* 7. 22 and the general idea of an enclosure within Phrasidamus’ farm suggested by the description of the festive setting (ll. 135–146); and it is worth noting that ἀνίκα δὲ καὶ σαῦρος ἐν αἶμασαι καθεύδει, “when even the lizard sleeps in the stone-wall” (*Id.* 7.22), may not be irrelevant to the association of the hedge with siesta in *Ecl.* 1.53–55. αἶμασαι is properly a stone-wall, but there is evidence to suggest that it is also used of a wall festooned with thorn-branches (see Gow on *Id.* 1.47). Whether this is how Virgil thought of it or not, the use of both αἶμασαι and *saepes* as boundary marks suffices to explain the equivalence. Further, if the ecphrastic boy of *Id.* 1.45–54 is as emblematic as he seems to be (see most recently Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 143–145), it is no surprise that Virgil saw the αἶμασαι on which the boy sits as a typical-familiar pastoral landmark which then as *saepes* found its rightful place in *Ecl.* 1.53. Viewing *saepes* in this light is at least as important as noting that the boundary hedge and the concomitant concept of property introduce a tension with the ideals of the pastoral community, let the ‘real world’ into the bower or show Meliboeus unpastorally keen on boundaries and fearful of their violation.

¹⁴ However, while “Sicilian bees” equals no doubt Theocritus, “bees” in itself has a programmatic history of its own, and in this light Wright’s (1983) 137–138 view that the sacred streams and bees of *Id.* 7.133–145 are allusively linked with Callimachus’ programmatic *Hymn* 2.108–109 appears even more compelling.

¹⁵ If the connection of Lucretius *DRN* 4.580–589 with *Ecl.* 1 can be considered established (see Breed (2000) 11–13), *fistula siluestrem ne cesset fundere musam*, “so that the

Lines 46–58 resonate with the themes of familiarity and continuity essential to a sense of tradition;¹⁶ they have a sense of tradition written into them.¹⁷

For what Virgil did was to use the general outline of a celebrated summer day in a Coan farm in order to transpose what was incidental, circumstantial and particular there into a potential infinity. The Theocritean passage, itself a crowning moment within a poem that, along with *Id.* 1, had come to be seen as crucial to its poet's bucolic project, is lusciously scored through a repetition of sounds and sound-producing movements in the imperfect: δονέοντο, κελάρυξε, τρύξεσκεν, αἶδον, ἔστενε, πωτῶντο. *Ecl.* 1.46–58, implicitly as well as explicitly, declines the same assortment of sounds in the future: in a landscape which, in relation to Phrasidamus' farm, has been opened up towards the future,

pipe never ceases to pour forth the woodland muse" (l. 589) may have contributed both to the verbal form of *Ecl.* 1.57 (*nec ... cessabit*, "nor will it cease") and to the idea of uninterrupted continuity as a whole. In the perspective of reflexivity, *Ecl.* 1.56, *alta sub rupe canet*, "[the pruner] under that high bluff will sing", which conveys the boundless repeatability of the act of singing as a defining feature of Tityrus' pastoral existence, is of a different order from that of the future tense of [Theoc.] 8.55 ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τᾷ πέτρᾳ τᾷδ' ἄσομαι, "beneath this rock I will sing".

Virgil's wood-pigeons and turtle-doves in *Ecl.* 1.57–58 are intertextual soundboards in much the same way as Keats's nightingale is:

Thou wast not born for death, immortal Bird!
No hungry generations tread thee down;
The voice I hear this passing night was heard
In ancient days by emperor and clown:
Perhaps the self-same song that found a path
Through the sad heart of Ruth, when, sick for home,
She stood in tears amid the alien corn;
The same that oft-times hath
Charm'd magic casements, opening on the foam
Of perilous seas, in faery lands forlorn.

The bird alights upon the Ode replete with its singing past and after having perched on a number of intertexts; thus "immortality" tropes the prospect of its (textual) voice's limitless iterability, and "this passing night" hosts a singing eternity.

¹⁶ On the concepts of tradition, succession and continuity as the driving forces of the poetic acts represented in pastoral see Hubbard (1998) 20–21.

¹⁷ As, of course, have the eclogue's five opening lines, significantly spoken by the same Meliboeus. See Breed (2000). Adapting the terms in which Buxton (1994) 15 (cf. Hunter (2003b) 230) defines myth, we might further think of *Ecl.* 1.46–58 as a kind of foundational pastoral narrative which, for all its being Tityrus-oriented, points to a tradition of collective significance to a particular group even as it constitutes an interpretative community. A similar sense of shared significance and tradition attaches to all those snapshots and vignettes that form the staple of the exchanges in the course of pastoral song contests.

the soporific buzzing of the bees from the immemorial hedge, the rustle of the willow in the breeze, the song of the pruner (*frondator*: a Virgilian subject for a 'futurised' ἄειδον) and the moaning of pigeons and turtle-doves seem to transform a bucolic highlight into timeless pastoral discourse. Certainly, they make Tityrus' prospective happiness the repeat of a past written through. Let history's (and Octavian's) agents ply their trade; you can always appropriate, or re-appropriate, the pastoral space by allusion, citation, iteration.¹⁸

I would, then, suggest that Meliboeus' portrayal as the victimised weakling wallowing in impotent nostalgia and as the negation of Theocritean bucolic is in need of some revision.¹⁹ Indeed, such assessments of his role in the eclogue confirm that, despite their high concentration, the signposts of reflexive annotation I have been pointing out are so cunningly integrated that readers have been mesmerised into noting little beyond the obviously haunting and deeply-felt lyricism of the piece. However, the emotional depiction of two painfully different human lots that leaves 'tensions unresolved' is also a tale of great intellectual import which involves conceptions, both differing and overlapping, of poetry, history, politics and time.²⁰

To be sure, differences are more visible in what I have said so far. If *pascite ut ante boues, pueri; summittite tauros*, "graze cattle as before, my

¹⁸ One may talk here, as Perkell (1990) 50–51 does, of pastoral imagination transforming the barren reality of *Ecl.* 1.47–48—as long as it is clear what exactly such imagination consists in.

¹⁹ Hubbard (1998) 53–54 is just about as categorical as one can be here: Meliboeus is the "antithesis and denial" of Theocritean bucolic just as Tityrus is its "rightful successor". On Meliboeus' alleged lyrical powerlessness see the survey of Perkell (1990) 52.

²⁰ Tensions, ambiguities, impossibility of definitive answers, suspension, but also harmonisation between apparent polarities such as art and politics, make up the interpretative framework of critical work on the *Eclogues* which is broadly committed to New Criticism. The important work of Putnam (1970) and Alpers (1979) illustrates the most crucial aspects of this approach, at the heart of which one sooner or later comes up against the question of the representation of pastoral space and its inhabitants. Heavily historicised, Marxist readings of the *Eclogues* as a class-driven genre, and formalist distrust of referential reality define the two ends of the spectrum between which, as Connolly (2001) 106 has recently remarked, New Critical readings of the *Eclogues* tend to view Arcadia as an idealised space that takes in politics and history while also denying it "a permanent space or the final word". Marking a shift from pastoral as "theme" to pastoral as "convention", Hubbard's (1998) comprehensive study concentrates on pastoral as poetry concerned mainly with literary tradition and the poet's quest, as he puts it, "for a new and independent voice that can stand up to the cumulative weight of tradition". Hubbard (1998) 1–18 and Connolly (2001) 89–99, each for his own purposes, take useful stock of the situation.

children, and yoke bulls”, as reported by Tityrus (*Ecl.* 1.45), suggests that the pastoral space-time continuum has been subsumed within the historical-political order, Meliboeus’ immediate response is to reassert the pastoral chronotope through his reflexive futures, countering the Rome-monitored historical time that first threatens and then restores Tityrus to his familiar life with what we might see as a timeless pastoral discourse—a historicist versus a textualist account of pastoral’s capacity to survive and thrive. That Meliboeus will then go on to blame civil war for *his losses* in 1.64–78 means no more than that the poem is not designed as a how-textuality-helps-you-preserve-your-pastoral sort of pamphlet. The political crisis that victimises Meliboeus while leaving Tityrus unscathed is there as the major source of dramatic tension, but whatever polarities are thrown up by the interaction of the characters and their respective lots there is no question of static opposition. The polarity between a “historicist” Tityrus and a “textualist” Meliboeus is a case in point.

Can Tityrus the worldly-wise and the Rome-besotted, the one who is sitting pretty with Octavian’s edict under his belt, ever get to understand the full significance of the future and, especially, the futures Meliboeus lavishes upon him? If *Ecl.* 1.7–8 is anything to go by, the poem both sets up a polarity and hints at the prospect of its deconstruction: *namque erit ille mihi semper deus, illius aram / saepe tener nostris ab ouilibus imbuet agnus*, “Yes, he will always be a god for me; his altar a tender ram-lamb from our folds will often stain”. The futures *erit* and *imbuet* point to a pattern of regular repetition in the form of a ritual to be practised within the pastoral world licensed by the *iuuenis*; and they are qualified by *semper* and *saepe* respectively, the very same adverbs that Meliboeus will presently use as part of his reflexive modalities. Is Tityrus here pledging a strictly personal thanksgiving for as long as he will live or is he commending his god to the broader pastoral community? And if one looks at his pledge in the retrospective light of 1.46–58, is it just possible that he is groping towards a way of inserting his historical, time-bound figure into the kind of pastoral timelessness envisaged by Meliboeus?

The question should be considered in conjunction with *Ecl.* 5 where Daphnis is partly patterned on the fortunes of the historical figure of Julius Caesar. The parallels are worth noting: Tityrus’ *iuuenis* and the Daphnis of *Ecl.* 5 are both dispensers of *otium*, “leisure” (*Ecl.* 1.6 *deus nobis haec otia fecit*, “a god has made this leisure ours” ~ *Ecl.* 5.60–61 *nec lupus insidias pecori, nec retia ceruis / ulla dolum meditantur: amat*

bonus otia Daphnis, “the wolf intends no ambush to the flock, the nets no trickery to deer: Daphnis the god loves peace”); further, Tityrus’ *namque erit ille mihi semper deus*, “yes, he will always be a god for me” (*Ecl.* 1.7), is amplified in *Ecl.* 5.64 *deus, deus ille, Menalca!*, “a god, a god is he, Menalcas!”, where the repetition also echoes *Lucr.* 5.8 *deus ille fuit, deus*, “a god was he, a god”; and, more importantly, Daphnis is promised annual offerings in much the same terms as Tityrus’ young god (*Ecl.* 1.7, 43 ~ *Ecl.* 5.65–68, 79–80).²¹ Despite the fact that, unlike the dignitary Tityrus grooms for pastoral canonisation, the subject of the two songs in *Ecl.* 5 is an established and distinguished presence in the life of the countryside, both figures can be seen to be caught up in an interplay between historicising and pastoralising moves. By the same token, Tityrus, whose eloquent promotion of the pastoral world’s historicisation I have been stressing so far, may at the same time be attempting a dehistoricising move with a view to making his political saviour quotable and iterable within the kind of pastoral discourse Meliboeus stands for, possibly on his practical understanding that ritual commemoration on a regular basis is as close as political figures can get to becoming subjects of the pastoral future continuous. Whichever is the case (and it is not necessarily a disjunctive one), if it is plausible to maintain that the Julian dimension of the *otium*-loving Daphnis in *Ecl.* 5 may be pointing to the shape of the Augustan things to come, it is, I think, equally fair to see in Tityrus’ manoeuvre an early exercise in Augustan discourses.²²

²¹ There is room for speculating here that Tityrus’ determination in *Ecl.* 1 to annually honour his “young god” as dispenser of *otium* and rural prosperity may also be indebted to the wish for repetition of the celebration in honour of “Demeter of the threshing floor” (βομῶ παρ Δάματρος ἀλωίδος, l. 155) that seals *Id.* 7, and immediately follows Simichidas’ description of the *locus amoenus* and its complete *hasychia*.

²² The fact that in the late 40s Octavian was still in his early twenties and, presumably, not eminent enough for such a project to get under way should be weighed against the enthused Cicero of *Phil.* 5.43: *quis tum nobis, quis populo Romano obtulit hunc diuinum adulescentem deus?* “which god at that time offered to us, to the Roman people, this godlike young man?”. Hardie (this volume, p. 291), who focuses on some important aspects of Lucretius’ impact on the *Eclogues*, especially what he terms “cultural and historical narratives”, remarks that “the Julian allegory barely concealed in the figure of Daphnis shows Virgil already adapting the structures of Lucretian cultural history to what will become the ideology of the *pax Augusta*”. Hardie brings Tityrus in line with Daphnis as a lover of *otium*, but what seems to me more important with regard to *Ecl.* 1 is the parallel of the pastoral hero of *Ecl.* 5 and Tityrus’ “god” as authoritative figures that have the power to give *otium*. In a thoroughly Epicurean reading of *Ecl.* 1, Rundin (2003) 161–163 argues that Tityrus’ *deus* is assimilated to Lucretius’ Epicurus. On “Augustan discourse” see Barchiesi (1997a) 8–11.

The partial dilution of the contrast between “historicist” Tityrus and “textualist” Meliboeus with regard to their perspectives on time in particular should alert the reader to further possibilities of dialectical mobility. The very specific point I am making is that if Meliboeus’ pastoral *tour de force* in *Ecl.* 1.46–58 is a response to politics raised to crisis pitch, then we can begin to see the political *emergency* and Meliboeus’ *intensified* reflexivity as heuristic variants rather than naturalised, pre-given constants locked up in conflict.²³ For a full view of this give and take we must wait until *Ecl.* 9, where history and politics seem to have gone indiscriminately berserk. But since this is a story of ever-shifting patterns and relationships, in the second part of my contribution I will first look beyond the obvious pair of *Ecl.* 1 and 9 at the collection as a whole to see whether Meliboeus’ kind of textuality is not something more deep and subtly interfused than its interaction with history and politics would seem to suggest.²⁴

2. *How to do words with things*

All eclogues (with the apparent exception of *Ecl.* 4) are provided with or imply an outermost *negotium*-frame (be it historical events on the grandest scale or everyday chores awaiting the shepherds) which limits the space of pastoral *otium* with its attendant musical and poetic activities.²⁵ The traditional hierarchy of priorities implied by such framing

²³ See Martindale (1997) 120–121: “yet aesthetics and politics (in this like genres) may be thought of as differential terms rather than ontological entities, in which case each term is necessarily present within the other, at however occluded a level. *And more pragmatically we can say that we need both discourses, and the Eclogues seem to acknowledge that need*” (my emphasis). Further, enlarging upon Martindale’s parenthetical reference to genre, we may also note that in *Ecl.* 1.46–58 “pastoral genre” appears under its most differential and dynamic aspect in that it is demonstrably a historical emergency that activates the self-reflexivity, the intertextual allusivity and the forces of centripetal abstraction (with regard to various intertexts, above all the Theocritean one) which mould the exemplary pastoralism of these lines.

²⁴ Despite differences in emphasis and objectives, it will be clear that my view of textuality in the *Eclogues* shares some of the premises on which Breed’s study of “time and textuality” in this volume is based. Especially, the “retrospective orientation of textuality”, which he systematically discusses (and whose importance for the interpretation of the *Eclogues* was particularly emphasized by Van Sickle (1978)) is essential for my notions of framing and fragmentation.

²⁵ Rumpf (1996) 205–206 notes that formal framing by an external narrative voice is characteristic of the even-numbered poems of the collection, yet what he calls “Rahmungsphänomene” are to be observed in the odd-numbered pieces too. Rumpf’s

is something pastoral characters never call into question. When, for instance, the Meliboeus of *Ecl.* 7 accepts Daphnis' invitation to put the herd on the autopilot and relax to attend the upcoming singing match, he is aware that he is putting "play" before "serious business" (*posthabui tamen illorum mea seria ludo*, "however, I postponed my business for their play", l. 17)—just as he knows that play, however valorised, is just an interlude within the continuum of everyday routine. However, there is a distinct sense in which this hierarchy can be said to be challenged.

Thus, for instance, when in *Ecl.* 7.45–48 the serious business of protecting the flock from the summer heat becomes the stuff of which Corydon makes one of his songs in the course of the *ludus*, the framing is made to operate the other way around. The reversal is all the more noticeable as the phrase *solstitium pecori defendite*, "fend off the solstice from the flock" (47), takes up the verb Meliboeus the narrator uses *outside* the singing match to seriously refer to his protecting the young myrtles from the chill (*dum teneras defendo a frigore myrtos*, "while I shielded tender myrtles from the cold", 6); and, as if to thematise the reversal, heat replaces chill at the same time placing the quatrain *as mere song* at an even more distinct remove from the 'real' temperatures prevailing at the narrative level.

A rather more famous instance is *Ecl.* 9.23–25:

*Tityre, dum redeo (brevis est uia), pasce capellas,
et potum pastas age, Tityre, et inter agendum
occursare capro (cornu ferit ille) caueto.*

Tityrus, till I come (the way's short) feed the goats, and drive them fed to water, Tityrus, and take care while driving not to cross the he-goat—that one butts.

This is closely modelled on Theocr. 3.3–5, where a goatherd asks Tityrus to tend his goats and goes on to serenade Amaryllis. The request is a 'real' one, intended to release the speaker from the *seria* in view of the *ludus*; in Virgil it is *a mere song fragment* intertextually recollected and quoted by a pastoral character in the course of a singing relay-race.

thorough and systematic study makes useful points on the importance of framing or lack thereof for the poetics of the *Eclogues* (on what he terms "Rahmungspoetik" see esp. pp. 201–257), but he tends to ground his argument on a rather rigid distinction between "Prosa" and "Gesang" and thus loses sight of the manifold possibilities generated by their interplay, on which see below.

Borrowing a distinction from the so-called “ordinary-language philosophers”, we might say that Virgil ‘mentions’ what Theocritus had ‘used’.²⁶ The distinction will take us to speech-act theory and John L. Austin’s “performatives” in particular. According to Austin, performative utterances, unlike constative ones (which are descriptions of something and may be true or false), accomplish the act to which they refer and are neither true nor false²⁷—remember that Austin titled the essay I am referring to *How to do things with words*. *Id.* 3.3–5 constitutes just such a performative utterance in that by saying “tend my goats while I sing for Amaryllis” the goatherd performs the order-request to which his utterance refers. However, for a performative to be genuine Austin posits “ordinary circumstances” of discourse, which excludes the words being spoken by “an actor on the stage or introduced in a poem”, for in such cases language is used “in ways *parasitic* upon its normal use”. On this definition, both the request of *Id.* 3.3–5 and that of *Ecl.* 9.23–25 are pretended speech-acts parasitical on the non-pretended, only *Ecl.* 9.23–25, being twice removed from ordinary circumstances, is *doubly* so.

A rather more complicated picture emerges when we note that Virgil uses the same Theocritean intertext of *Id.* 3.3–5 just in the way Theocritus himself does (that is, as part of the ‘ordinary’ exchange that precedes the singing competition as such) in *Ecl.* 5.12, *pascentis servuabit Tityrus haedos*, “Tityrus will watch the grazing kids”, where the affirmative mood is apparently related to *Id.* 1.14, τὰς δ’ αἴγας ἐγὼν ἐν τῷδε νομευσῶ, “meanwhile I’ll tend the goats”. Thus, in a two-tiered move (and on a sequential reading of the *Eclogues* book), he frames both the original Theocritean “performative” and his own two-pronged allusion to Theocritus in *Ecl.* 5.12 as a pure song fragment in *Ecl.* 9.23–25.

Since the niceties of speech-act theory is not my concern here, I would simply say that through intratextual as well as intertextual

²⁶ On this see the lucid remarks of Culler (1983) 119 n. 5: “the distinction seems clear and important in the classic examples: *Boston is populous* uses the word or expression *Boston*, while *‘Boston’ is disyllabic* does not use the expression but mentions it—mentions the word ‘Boston’ by using an expression which is a metaname”. The distinction is bound up with the question of “seriousness”: “I *use* the expressions insofar as I seriously intend the meanings of the sign sequences I utter; I *mention* them when I reiterate some of these signs (within quotation marks, for example), without committing myself to the meaning they convey”.

²⁷ See Culler (1983) 110–134, esp. 114–120. Miller (2001) 6–62 offers an exhaustive account of Austin’s speech act theory, along with a thorough critique of the ideology underlying his examples.

repetition the performative notion of “someone tending the goats so that another may sing” is processed into pure “singing performance”, a flagrant textual citation which is set to echo down pastoral discourses (especially as a kick-starter for more songs to come) and whose original function as an utterance bound to a unique occasion within the context of *seria* is completely tuned out. As it happens, *Id.* 3.3–5 seems itself already ripe for the treatment Virgil had in store for it, as its first two lines (Κωμάσδω ποτὶ τὰν Ἀμαρυλλίδα, τὰ δέ μοι αἴγες / βόσκονται κατ’ ὄρος, καὶ ὁ Τίτυρος αὐτὰς ἐλαύνει, “I am serenading Amaryllis, my goats are grazing on the mountain and Tityrus herds them”) have an unmistakable ring of citationality about them; as John Henderson notes, “*Idyll* 3 itself began by dramatizing its own citationality [i.e. The Amaryllis serenade begins by announcing itself]: ‘I am [i.e. This is] the Amaryllis serenade’”.²⁸

That the daily round of the shepherds’ life should form the staple of the songs exchanged among them is hardly surprising,²⁹ yet the interplay between framing speech and framed song, work performative and song performance will tend to obtrude upon the reader’s attention when a gesture, statement or command occurs *both* within and outside the singing space proper *within the boundaries of a single poem*—and this, far from being original with Virgil, is already the case in Theocritus. In *Id.* 5 Lacon, the shepherd, orders his lambs away from the spring (οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς κρήνας; σίττ’, ἀμνίδες, l. 3) in the course of his initial altercation with Comatas, the goatherd; the latter will then take up the command, with some variation, as part of his contribution to the singing match (σίττ’ ἀπὸ τῆς κοτίνω τὰι μηγάδες, “hey kids, get away from the wild olive”, l. 100).³⁰ There is a different kind of effect here from the one we noted in relation to *Ecl.* 7.6 and 47, but the variation on speaker and stage props serves equally to underwrite the self-conscious play between “serious performative” and “staged performance”, and it is one that will force itself on the reader’s attention.³¹

²⁸ Henderson (1998b) 166 n. 62.

²⁹ According to the principle formulated by Propertius, 2.1.43–44: *navita de uentis, de tauris narrat arator, / enumerat miles uulnera, pastor ouis*, “the sailor talks of winds, the ploughman of oxen, the soldier counts his wounds, the shepherd his sheep”.

³⁰ *Id.* 5 contains more, and more spicy, of the same: Comatas, the overweening penetrator, adds song (ἢ οὐ μέμνησ’, ὅκ’ ἐγὼ τυ κατήλασα, “do you forget the day I came on to you?”, l. 116) to the plain injury of ἀνέκ’ ἐπέγχεόν τυ, “when I penetrated you” (l. 41).

³¹ It also contributes to the dilution of whatever “reality effect” is intended through such references to the pastoral routine. Cf. Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 148.

Thomas G. Rosenmeyer's "[i]n a sense pastoral singing contests are merely extensions of the potential that resides in the pastoral conversations" would no doubt be more pertinent to the pronounced and sustained symmetries of Virgil's pastoral.³² But as Rosenmeyer again notes, *otium* is frequent and explicit in Virgil and rarely mentioned as such by Theocritus. If the Roman operates with ideologically embedded antonyms (*negotium-otium*, *seria-ludus*) where the Greek may be peddling more or less high-brow aspirations to ἀσυχία, then the challenge to the hierarchy of priorities, implied by a framing that works the other way round, may well have been felt to be something more than a formalist play with the genre's constitutional self-representation as *ludus* on the margins of *seria* or as interlude between *seria*—a highly original and alternative (rustic) version of the cultural challenge issued by the first neoteric generation on the *urbanitas* platform. By comparison with Theocritus, Virgil seems to more clearly conceptualise and valorise serious business *vs* play, (real) life *vs* song;³³ and yet at the same time, in his more formalised and concentrated pastoral with its intensified strategies of citationality, "life" (one-off performatives and much else besides) looks ever closer to the range of the quotation marks. At the core of this textualising process (which would more than have rung a bell for the Meliboeus of *Ecl.* 1.46–58) is to be found what I will refer to as pastoral's "will-to-fragmentation".

3. *How to bring the Cyclops down a fragment or two*

Corydon's 68-line monologue in *Ecl.* 2 is all lavished on a full-blooded and interactive Alexis; then the urban youth reappears in a competitive four-line fragment in *Ecl.* 7.53–56, where *formosus Alexis* (... *at si formosus Alexis / montibus his abeat, uideas et flumina sicca*, "but if fair Alexis should leave these hills, you'd even see the streams run dry") comes with as strong a quotation effect as that which calls for editorial quotes

³² Rosenmeyer (1969) 156. However, "merely extensions" would be doing less than justice to the self-consciousness with which song harks back to conversational exchanges and conversation prefigures some turns and twists of the song contest. Henderson (1999) 158 has a fine remark on how the initial exchanges in speech of *Ecl.* 3 "already contest for rhetorical superiority".

³³ On the frequency of *otium* in Latin pastoral texts as compared with the rarity of the equivalent ἀσυχία in Theocritus see Rosenmeyer (1969) 67–68. On the *otium* entailed in the Roman practice of repairing to the countryside see Miles (1980) 12–30.

in *Ecl.* 5.86 *haec nos "formosum Corydon ardebat Alexin"*, "this taught us 'Corydon burned for beautiful Alexis'". One of the effects of reading the *Eclogues* as a sequence is to find the καλός of the sustained and self-contained drama of *Ecl.* 2 in the reduced circumstances of a mere title and a fragmentary quotation.³⁴ Not that he was ever possessed of some kind of originary solidity; his dramatically ample debut is itself played out in quotes following a narrative introduction, but on his two subsequent entries the marks close further in on what has become a *familiar* summary: "Alexis". On my reading of *Ecl.* 1.51, *nota* is the equivalent of the quotes.

Similarly, Amaryllis,³⁵ the citational cynosure of all pastoral eyes, *stands her dramatic ground* first as the beloved, corrective and devoted partner of Tityrus in *Ecl.* 1.5, 30 and 36, and then as curtain lecturer (*tristis Amaryllidis iras*, "the wrath of Amaryllis", l. 14) and chestnut-aficionado (*castaneasque nuces, mea quas Amaryllis amabat*, "and chestnuts, which my Amaryllis used to love", l. 52) in Corydon's love life in *Ecl.* 2; but when she resurfaces in a single couplet in *Ecl.* 3.80–81 (*triste lupus stabulis, maturis frugibus imbres, / arboribus uenti, nobis Amaryllidis ira*, "wolves are a sad thing for the folds, rain for ripe crops, gales for the trees, and Amaryllis' wrath for us") she sounds more like a pastoral household-name emblazoned with the well-known trademark of her abrasiveness. If we activate, as we are probably meant to do, the dramatic background of *Ecl.* 2 where her temper is first referred to, *Amaryllidis iras* here, compared to the same syntagm in *Ecl.* 2.14, feels highly "mentioned", parasitised and reappropriated by Damoetas as "the temperamental Amaryllis of our songs"—a fragmented echo without commitment to any particular authorial voice, let

³⁴ As well as pointing out the possibilities of non-linear, retrospective reading, re-reading and synchronic viewing of Virgil's pastoral collection, Breed's contribution to this volume fruitfully explores, under the aspect of textuality, the various effects of a "linear experience of reading through the [*Eclogues*] book in order".

³⁵ Is the thrifty Amaryllis of *Ecl.* 1 a reformed or "prelapsarian" character? And is her post as assistant or associate of the sorceress of *Ecl.* 8.64–109 of a piece with her other hats? (on the Amaryllis of *Ecl.* 9 see below). On the question of dramatic consistency or development across the individual *Eclogues* on the basis of synonymy see below. The Amaryllis of *Id.* 3 is as dramatically substantial as the Alexis of *Ecl.* 2 is, and yet, as noted above, Theocritus ushers her in in a highly citational passage; and the citational ring grows clearer in *Id.* 4.38 where ὁ χαρίεστος Ἀμαρυλλί, "o lovely Amaryllis" takes up the invocation introducing the κῶμος proper at *Id.* 3.6, and does so in a context that significantly pledges special commemorative treatment—"you alone we will never forget, even though you are dead". If the idea of commemoration as a trope for citationality glimmers here, Virgil was quick to see it.

alone a lover, one that has always already resonated through the pastoral space and will probably continue often (*saepe*) or always (*semper*) to do so.³⁶

If Amaryllis, like Alexis, courts the quotes and aspires to the condition of “un fragment anthologique”, so does Daphnis, pastoral’s cult figure. In *Ecl.* 5 he has his death and apotheosis equally portioned out between the singers Mopsus (20–44) and Menalcas (56–80). Although by the standards of musical exchanges the portions are sizeable (25 verses each) and between them yield a fairly sustained narrative, there is a strong sense in which the complementary contributions are framed as separate *fragments* from the life and afterlife of a pastoral hero. Since Thyrsis’ song on the equally “biographical” Δάφνιδος ἄλγεα in *Id.* 1 is a solo performance represented as a select “hit” from a wider repertoire, we might see *Ecl.* 5 as carrying on a process of “breaking down” in terms both of narrators and narrative which, in turn, adds yet another set of framing and affects the cumulative total of the quotation effect.³⁷ The result has been well captured by Philip Hardie: “but the frame for the two songs reveals that these vivid expressions of grief and jubilation were always just texts”.³⁸ In the case of *Ecl.* 5 Virgil may have just brought out and put on stage, as it were, the competitive set-up that forms the background to *Id.* 1, on the assumption that “Daphnis” will have been Thyrsis’ entry in a singing match on a previous occasion, probably against a singer with a comparable subject. As it happens, *Ecl.* 9.46–50 takes the increasingly fragmented and textualised Daphnis of *Ecl.* 5 one stage further:

Daphni, quid antiquos signorum suspicis ortus?
ecce Dionaei processit Caesaris astrum,
astrum quo segetes gauderent frugibus et quo
duceret apricis in collibus uua colorem.
*insere, Daphni, puros: carpent tua poma nepotes.*³⁹

³⁶ For a parallel progression of an increasingly fragmented Medea towards citationality see Hinds (1993) 46 and Hardie (2002) 254.

³⁷ On various aspects of Theocritean song as repeat performance and finished product of earlier competitions see Acosta-Hughes and Pretagostini, in this volume.

³⁸ Hardie (2002) 21.

³⁹ I take the whole passage of *Ecl.* 9.44–50 to be spoken by Lycidas. The apparent inconsistency between inadequate memory (9.44–45) and the eventual citation immediately afterwards (which leads a number of scholars to attribute 9.46–50 to Moeris) is no such thing, especially when viewed in light of the preceding *si ualeam meminisse*, “jogging my memory” (9.38), and its sequel. Most importantly, as I argue below, faltering memory is a reflexive ploy.

Daphnis, why watch the ancient risings of the Signs? See where the star of Dionean Caesar passes, the star when cornfields should rejoice in crops and when grape-clusters on the sunny slopes should colour up. Graft pear-trees, Daphnis. Grandchildren will pick your fruit.

Remember that in the apotheosis song of *Ecl.* 5.56–80, which comes after a lament that stresses nature's faltering in sympathy with the countryside hero's death, Daphnis enjoys a stellar position in his own right and is himself the cause of a universal euphoria that includes rural prosperity. Now, to the sequential reader of the *Eclogues* book activating this narrative background, the Daphnis of *Ecl.* 9.46–50, who now takes a back seat as *purely the viewer* of a beneficial stellar phenomenon, will probably look rather alienated from the "originary signified" which Daphnis as countryside hero and myth of origins (and in the case of *Ecl.* 5, as Julian component) represents for the pastoral community—a floating name in a slot that might have been occupied by any other pastoral, or even non-pastoral, bystander. And this is the result of progressive fragmentation working against the gravitational pull of more sustained Daphnis narratives, be they pre-Theocritean, broadly Hellenistic, Theocritean or Virgilian.⁴⁰ Fragments cannot be shored up against such disintegration; and by the time one gets to them, quotes and citationality look very much like their own reward.

Fragments make more immediately perceptible the processes of putting between quotation marks, framing and recontextualising that affect all texts, thereby making them aware of themselves as texts; they invite iteration and dissemination; and they point up the hazards to authorial control and intention. The snippets that are volleyed about in pastoral's singing matches are no more calculated to inspire the conviction of firm authorial control, whether literary-historical or fictional, any more than fragmentary Amaryllis, Phyllis, Lycidas and the like are presented as firmly controlled by any single lover. The pastoral world is too endogamous to be above partner-swapping, but this is not the point here; nor is it a question of communal possession so much as a strategy of liberation through dispossession which keeps up a mobility among the literary-historically authenticated, the pastorally fictional and the historically real—the poet, his intertextual providers, his char-

⁴⁰ A sense of "ellipsis", "allusiveness" and of less "than is actually there" hangs programmatically, as it were, about the tale of Daphnis sung by Thyrsis in *Id.* 1. I am borrowing the terms used by Hunter (1999) 63, whose introductory discussion of Thyrsis' song in this respect is particularly illuminating.

acters in the poem, us readers.⁴¹ Again, in this respect, as in others, the textuality of Virgilian pastoral follows up, intensifies and gives dramatic self-consciousness to distinct Theocritean practices. If at the end of *Ecl.* 5 “Menalcas’ ‘quotation’ of the openings of the second and third *Eclogues* breathtakingly collapses the fictional world of Virgilian shepherds into the world of the poet and his readers”,⁴² it is fair to say that there is nothing nearly as “breathtaking” in Theocritus, whose hints at past song performances are less sharply, if at all, personalized, and seem rather to be directed at some kind of pre-literary or extratextual space.

On the basis of these considerations, a quest for dramatic consistency and meaningful patterns of development geared to the recurrence of characters of the same name in different poems becomes increasingly problematic. Robert Coleman, after remarking that the Amaryllis appearing in different poems is consistent enough to make a biographical sketch of her possible, resigns himself to the more pragmatic conclusion that “there is [in Virgil], as in Theocritus, nothing much to be gained (or for that matter lost) from a general assumption that the recurrence of the same name is significant”.⁴³ It is interesting, though, that Amaryllis should have been credited, even if half-heartedly, with consistency and it would be as good a guess as any that this assumption has something to do with her chronic inability to be anything but sad or irate or both (*maesta*, *Ecl.* 1.36; *tristis* ... *iras*, 2.14; *irae*, 3.81). But that would mean riding roughshod over “use”, “mention”, framing and quotes.

Which, given the vulnerability of the hierarchies I have been describing, one might just as well do:

A promise I make is real; a promise in a play is a fictional imitation of a real promise, an empty iteration of a formula used to make real promises. But in fact one can argue that the relation of dependency works the other way as well. If it were not possible for a character in a play to make a promise, there could be no promises in real life, for what makes it possible to promise [...] is the existence of a conventional procedure, of formulas one can repeat. For me to be able to make a promise in “real

⁴¹ Breed, this volume, pp. 343–344 rightly points out that some of the characters in the collection (Lycoris in *Ecl.* 10, Apollo in *Ecl.* 6, Pollio in *Ecl.* 3) are projected as “readers”, thus bridging “the gap between pastoral fictions and the real world, providing models for any and all of the *Eclogues*’ actual readers”.

⁴² Hardie (2002) 21.

⁴³ Coleman (1977) 25.

life”, there must be iterable procedures or formulas, such as are used on stage. “Serious” behaviour is a special case of role-playing.⁴⁴

Pastoral has a field day with “iterable procedures and formulas” alternating with “real life”, and there is a good chance that, after prolonged exposure to it, you will get your quotes wrong—or reach a point where you open and close them at will.

Ecl. 9 further illustrates these points while offering some interesting twists of its own. The poem is about absence, dispossession and a world falling to pieces; and this time round there are no exceptions to the havoc wrought by history and politics. Lycidas and Moeris chance upon each other on the way to the town. With land confiscations a *fait accompli*, Moeris discloses that the events have made his farm over to a veteran and left him as a tenant paying rent to the new owner. Menalcas, with whom Moeris seems closely associated, has been less fortunate: despite rumours to the contrary, heard by Lycidas, his songs were not enough to stave off expropriation. The rest, at Lycidas’ instigation and despite the weary reluctance of ageing Moeris, is a concerted attempt on the part of the two characters to vindicate the absent Menalcas by way of quoting fragments from his repertoire.⁴⁵ This *Eclogue*, preceding the piece which formally declares the collection rounded off, is the only one that in a more or less explicit manner represents the songs as retrieved fragments, incomplete drafts or incompletely remembered compositions; and it is one where the sense of disintegration seems to suffuse particular features of landscape and mental faculties alike.

The quest for absent Menalcas gets off to a poignantly allusive start with *Ecl.* 9.23–25, which must be briefly re-visited in its full context:

*uel quae sublegi tacitus tibi carmina nuper,
cum te ad delicias ferres Amaryllida nostras?
“Tityre, dum redeo (brevis est uia), pasce capellas,
et potum pastas age, Tityre, et inter agendum
occursare capro (cornu ferit ille) caueto”.*

or there’s the song I lately overheard from you, the day you made your way to our darling Amaryllis: “Tityrus, till I come (the way’s short) feed

⁴⁴ Culler (1983) 119 in the course of a level-headed account of Derrida’s critique of J.L. Austin’s exclusion of “non-serious”, “pretended” utterances from performatives. He concurs with Derrida in believing that the deconstruction of the hierarchy “serious”–“non serious” is an intrinsic possibility of language.

⁴⁵ It is especially with regard to *Ecl.* 9 that Martindale (1997) 120 talks of “a poetics of fragmentation”.

the goats, and drive them fed to water, Tityrus, and take care while driving not to cross the he-goat—that one butts”.

In a rendezvous for pastoral fiction and literary-historical fact, Lycidas overheard the song Moeris had picked up from master singer Menalcas who in turn had echoed another Hellenistic master-singer of his own. Whatever “practical” use Menalcas may have previously found for the Theocritean performative (which was presumably none), Moeris, as reported by Lycidas in *Ecl.* 9.21–22, replicates at the fictional level the Virgilian recontextualisation of the Theocritean “performative” as a performance fragment. With the iterability index thus raised, it is hard to see why commentators find it incumbent upon them to clarify whether we should credit with the aspirations of a staunch *uniuira* or the abandon of an all-purpose slut an Amaryllis who in her multiple quotes has by now become “the Amaryllis of our (Theocritus’, Virgil’s, Menalcas’, Moeris’, readers’) pastoral songs”⁴⁶—subject to yet another integrated reflexive technicality,⁴⁷ *nota*, always already, *saepe*, *semper* and forever yours for a song. Lycidas’ is the “sad” tale of a performative that has been reduced to the shadow of its former shadows; a free-floating fragment that has become a citational celebrity in its own right; and one that, far from being occasion-specific, is apt to come up whenever one wishes to kickstart pastoral discourse. Of course, we should not lose sight of the broader context: in terms of the emotional scenario, Lycidas recalls the fragment as a substitute for Menalcas’ physical presence; at the same time he energetically engages in the negotiations

⁴⁶ Clausen’s (1994) note on the *nostras* of *Ecl.* 9.22 is, if anything, indicative of the conundrums that bedevil a dramatic reading of the name: “**nostras**: opposed to *te*, ‘my sweetheart’; slightly aggrieved, as if to justify his own behaviour. Not therefore the sweetheart of Lycidas and Moeris (‘communem amicam’, Serv.) and certainly not ‘everyone’s favourite’ (Coleman)—‘such that the swains desired her’ (Conington)”.

⁴⁷ *sublegi* suggests chance overhearing or eavesdropping, but it also points to analogous formulations in the language used by ancient critics to refer to intertextual relations between poets in particular. Intertextuality is troped or “penalised”, as the case may be, by the concepts of stealthiness, surreptitiousness and filching. One of the first surveys of Virgilian intertextuality, that by Perellius Faustus, was titled “Furta”; in *Suas.* 3.7, the Elder Seneca uses another sub-composite to describe a *furtum* by Ovid—made *non subripiendi causa, sed palam mutuandi, hoc animo ut uellet agnoscī*, “not in order to steal it but to openly borrow it, intending it to be recognised”, and the same verb is used by Macrobius, *Sat.* 5.16.12 to refer to Virgil’s borrowing from Homer: *hoc quoque dissimulando subripuit*, “this too he stole in a disguised manner”. Thus *sublegi* should probably be added to our list of reflexive annotations. On the attitudes of ancient criticism to open or concealed borrowing see Hinds (1998) 22–25.

that take the fragment further and further away from authorial presence and control.⁴⁸

As if *Ecl.* 9.23–25 did not sound fragmentary enough, Moeris responds with a three-line quotation which is explicitly presented as a piece left unfinished by Menalcas (9.26–29):⁴⁹

immo haec, quae Varo necdum perfecta canebat:
“Vare, tuum nomen, superet modo Mantua nobis,
Mantua uae miserae nimum uicina Cremonae,
cantantes sublime ferent ad sidera cygni”.

Yes, and the song (still incomplete) he made for Varus: “Varus, your name, if only Mantua be spared (Ah, Mantua, too near, alas, to poor Cremona!) shall be uplifted to the stars by singing swans”.

This apparently comes from one of Menalcas’ songs composed in the vain hope of keeping the pastoral space immune to history. If Moeris means this as a reminder of a unique event, complete with particular names and localities, that still rankles with him, then his intention seems thwarted by the dynamics of the exchange in which he is engaged: for what failed as an occasion-bound performative has already been launched on its career as a fragment quotable in any number of singing performances like the present one and independently of the circumstances and intentions of its author.⁵⁰ Indeed, exile even as it removes the singer allows the song its maximum purity as song, making it part of a timeless pastoral discourse⁵¹ placed beyond historical contingency. This time the Meliboeus of *Ecl.* 1 will be nodding with some kind of vicarious thrill.

⁴⁸ Breed (2000) 19 associates the “poetics of fragmentation” in *Ecl.* 9 with uncertainties as to the identity of the author(s) and chronological priority; cf. also this volume, pp. 365–366.

⁴⁹ Cf. Clausen’s (1994) note: “*necdum perfecta*: not an inert detail but added to give these lines the appearance of a fragment; the imperfect *canebat* also contributes to the effect”.

⁵⁰ Optimistic readers of *Ecl.* 9 tend to feel that the “unhappy” Varus fragment jars with their reading of the poem just as pessimists find the Daphnis fragment in ll. 46–50 incongruously “unhappy”—and then resort to special pleading to rescue their respective schemes of things. Sorting the poem’s song fragments into happy and unhappy goes hand in hand with the quandary over their exact source or authorship, with some critics denying that they all go back to Menalcas (on which see Perkell (2001), esp. 66–68). It will be evident that in my reading the answer to such questions is simply a corollary of the way I view fragmentarity as such.

⁵¹ Hardie’s (2002) 227–257 enterprising discussion of various aspects of Ovidian absent presences, and his remarks (292–296) on the function of letter-writing from exile, are relevant here.

Thus, just like pastoral routine, history, which in *Ecl.* 9 has conspicuously tightened its framing grip on pastoral song, finds itself framed by the latter. The manoeuvre seems to be lost on the young and overzealous Lycidas whose *incipi*, *si quid habes*, “lead off with what you can” (32), suggests that the best is yet to come. Moeris responds (9.37–43):

*Id quidem ago et tacitus, Lycida, mecum ipse uoluto,
si ualeam meminisse ; neque est ignobile carmen.
“huc ades, o Galatea ; quis est nam ludus in undis?
hic uer purpureum, uarios hic flumina circum
fundit humus flores, hic candida populus antro
imminet et lentae texunt umbracula uites.
huc ades ; insani feriant sine litora fluctus”.*

I mean to, Lycidas; I’m thinking it out now, jogging my memory, for it’s a famous song. “Come here, O Galatea. What sport is there in water? Here it is radiant springtime; here by the riverside earth pours forth the pied flowers; here the white poplar leans over a cave, and limber vines weave tents of shade. Come here, and leave the crazy waves to beat the beech”.

Moeris is downhearted and not young any more, so we should not be surprised if memory failed him altogether. However, memory is also a master trope for literary allusion,⁵² and the difficulties pleaded by the singer here (*si ualeam*) only serve to make the reflexive signposting even more noticeable; and somehow these difficulties produce the same emphasis as the litotes of the immediately following *neque est ignobile*, which makes the reflexivity of the line all but obtrusive, especially if one recalls the *nota* of *Ecl.* 1. 51. The song (*neque est ignobile carmen*) is famous within the pastoral tradition with which we as readers are familiar as well as within the fictional community that reveres Menalcas as its master singer;⁵³ and its career, so far as we know it, is very much one of framing and fragmentation.

Whatever the pre-Theocritean status and scope of “The Cyclops in love”, *Id.* 11 concentrates on the seaside serenade, a monologue of 61 lines presented to Nicias by means of a narrative frame that ironically

⁵² Conte’s discussion of Ariadne’s *memini* in *Fast.* 3.471–476 is seminal here; see Hinds (1998) 1–16 who offers a succinct and lucid account of this and other instances of “fully integrated reflexive annotation”.

⁵³ More importantly, perhaps, it is famous as a literary subject which, after a distinguished career in various genres and modes (on which see Hunter (1999) 215–217), came to be prominently involved in the construction of a more strictly pastoral tradition.

complicates the song's ostensible function as a cure for love. In *Id.* 6 the story becomes the subject of a singing contest between Damoetas and Daphnis, again contained by a narrative frame. Daphnis addresses his piece (6–19) directly to Polyphemus, Damoetas answers (21–41) “in persona Polyphemi”, yet both pieces revolve around the nymph's coquettish pelting with apples of Polyphemus' sheep and dog in the course of an amphibious flirtation. Compared to the monologue of *Id.* 11, where Polyphemus' plight, traced back to its origins in an adolescent *coup de foudre*, runs its full course from clumsy infatuation through oafish self-recommendation to jaunty resignation, the two songs of *Id.* 6 offer no more than a partial perspective on the airs and graces of the beauty and the delusions of the beast, thus coming across as fragments from an ongoing affair.⁵⁴

Virgil reserved the drama of the sustained monologue of *Id.* 11 for the Corydon of *Ecl.* 2 and pressed ahead with the breaking-down process already under way in Theocritus, at the same time allowing the resonance of Galatea to almost tune out the Cyclops. In the singing match of *Ecl.* 3 Galatea appears standardised as “apple thrower” and “love tease” in a competing couplet delivered by Damoetas: *malo me Galatea petit, lascia puella, / et fugit ad salices et se cupit ante uideri*, “Galatea, the cheeky girl, pelts me with apples, runs to the sally beds, and longs to be seen first” (ll. 64–65). This partly echoes *Id.* 6.6–7, βάλλει τοι, Πολύφαμε, τὸ ποίμνιον ἅ Γαλάτεια / μάλοισιν, δυσέρωτα καὶ αἰπόλον ἄνδρα καλεῦσα, “Galatea pelts your flock with apples, Polyphemus, and calls you star-crossed in love and goatherd”. As these verses open Daphnis' 18-verse instalment of the story, the Virgilian couplet effects a double move: it radicalises the Theocritean drive for fragmentation while at the same time its first verse functions in a manner that recalls the quotation by Menalcas in *Ecl.* 5.86–87 of the openings of *Ecl.* 2 and 3. Again, as in *Ecl.* 9.23–25, a fictional character replicates a literary-historical act of allusivity that also involves a dramatic reduction of scale; and again, progressive fragmentation seems to work to liberate quoted characters from their commitments to the broader narratives from which they hail, making them no more than “floating signifiers”. Thus, whereas in the verse that opens Daphnis' more spacious song in

⁵⁴ It is worth noting that despite the lack of external evidence for dating, there are strong reasons to believe that *Id.* 11 was composed earlier than *Id.* 6. See Gutzwiller (1991) 105–107 and Hunter (1999) 244–245.

Id. 6 the vocative Πολύφαμε keeps Galatea within the orbit of the well-known love story, the Galatea of *Ecl.* 3.64–65, frozen in the mischievous elusiveness that keeps Polyphemus on tenterhooks in the story as we know it, becomes equally elusive on a different level: is Damoetas her lover-singer or Polyphemus' impersonator or, perhaps, both?⁵⁵ And her encore, a few lines later (72–73), is, if anything, still more elusive.⁵⁶ But what needs to be said at this juncture is not so much that pastoral partners are open for endless authorial and erotic reappropriation as that pastoral, being what it is and because it does not “essentialise” its fictional lovers, leaves no room for even the mock indignation with which Ovid lets the cat out of the bag in *Am.* 3.12. Couched in frames and quotes and constantly aspiring to the condition of fragment, pastoral lovers flagrantly textualise promiscuity where other erotic discourses, for their own reasons, will artfully pull their punches and hedge their bets.

So when we ask “whatever has become of Polyphemus?” it is not because he seems to be sidelined as lover even where he is least expected to be so, as, for instance, in *Ecl.* 7.37–40;⁵⁷ it is rather because this expansive figure that starts his known literary career by claiming to himself some 465 verses of epic-heroic narrative is then softened up in all sorts of erotic recontextualisations only to end up as a mere echo in pastoral snippets of song, more faint than the fading fragment of “Hylas” in *Ecl.* 6.44. Is pastoral in its Virgilian version suggesting that all the world, including lovers and epic sagas, exists “pour aboutir dans un fragment”? Is the already always and forever of pastoral echo the ultimate trope-reward at the end of this process? Is not *formosa Amaryllis* as a mere echo resonating through the woods of *Ecl.* 1.5 where “the Amaryllis of our songs” has been heading for

⁵⁵ And, further, is he, as Marco Fantuzzi points out to me, also replicating Theocritean Damoetas' impersonation of Polyphemus in *Id.* 6?

⁵⁶ If the other Theocritean tease who also practises *μηλοβολία* in *Id.* 5.88–89 (βάλλει καὶ μάλοισι τὸν αἰπόλον ἃ Κλεαρίστα / τὰς αἴγας παρελᾶντα καὶ ἄδύ τι ποππυλιάσδει, “Clearista too pelts the goatherd with apples as he passes with his goats, and she whistles to him sweetly” has also melted into *Ecl.* 3.64–65, could Virgil's two-pronged allusion to Theocritus suggest that *as a fragment* Galatea is potentially apt to disown not just the narrative associations of her name but even the name itself?

⁵⁷ Here *Nerine Galatea* and *Hyblae* seem to point to the Sicilian archetype with the sea nymph and the Cyclops—just before Corydon, the singer of the quatrain, jumps into the latter's shoes: *si qua tui Corydonis habet te cura, uenito*, “if you have any care for Corydon, come to him” (7.40).

all the time? And has not the Cyclops foregone all contingencies in exchange for an echoic omnipresence, *just like the Menalcas of Ecl. 9 has?*⁵⁸

The paradox—if that is what it is—is now ripe for reaping. In *Ecl. 9* life in the countryside, memory and song, all seem to be disintegrating; and it may not be by chance that the beech-tops of the landscape *not* rescued by Menalcas' songs are broken—"the broken tree-tops are in harmony with the general mood".⁵⁹ No doubt; but while the mood has to do with history alone, the fragments are as much predicated on pastoral poetics as they are history-related, and therefore history does no more or worse than become complicit with pastoral's own will-to-fragmentation. At this level, the drama of history and politics both undermines pastoral and confirms its poetics of textuality—disruption, fragmentation, absence and expropriation, all becoming metaphors for some of the most deep-seated instincts of pastoral discourse.

4. *Some conclusions and a grand narrative*

Let me draw together some of the threads so far. At the most obvious level, the sharply differing fortunes of the two shepherds in *Ecl. 1* stress the ambivalence of history as both scourge and dispenser of pastoral song. Less obviously, loss makes of Meliboeus a master of reflexive annotation, so that, while Tityrus is content to sing a song authorised by the powers that be, his response makes the survival of pastoral song seem conditional on the intrinsic continuities of a familiar tradition of texts. Pitted against Tityrus' "historicism", Meliboeus' textuality, embodied in a series of reflexive futures, seeks to place the pastoral world beyond the time-bound and the historically contingent.

Yet no neat pattern of rivalry is forthcoming, as Tityrus is by no means innocent of the "dehistoricising" ploy entailed in the other's tex-

⁵⁸ Breed (2000) 19 remarks that "the quotations of fragmentary snatches of other people's poems in *Ecl. 9* approximate to the status of echo". Conversely, one may add, echoes are by nature fragmentary repetitions of the original sound. Hollander (1981) 1–5 offers, among other things, some interesting information on echo's acoustics.

⁵⁹ See Clausen's (1994) note *ad loc.*

tualist counterclaim; and it is in this perspective that the claim has been made that the terms of the habitually posited polarity between politics and poetics are best treated as heuristic variants rather than essential entities locked in conflict. In *Ecl.* 1 politics raised to crisis pitch puts Meliboeus on his textualist mettle. By the same token, in *Ecl.* 9 politics, now at its most terminally destructive for pastoral existence, goads the two shepherds into a frantic quest that results only in Menalcas' fragmentary presence as sheer text: as the volume of the variant "politics" is turned up so the variant "poetics" now climactically throws up the textualist modalities of citationality, iterability and fragmentarity. Further, the fact that, more than anywhere else in the *Eclogues*, the songs of *Ecl.* 9 are represented as explicit and faithful quotations may be accounted for on two levels: on the level of the historical-political drama played out in the poem, the drive to closely reproduce the original signals a paroxysmic act of memory as politics steps up its pressure and, therefore, it functions as a defensive reflex; at a more profound level, closeness to the original, which should make for an easier identification of authorship, acts as a foil for a textualist dynamics whose natural thrust is away from authorial presence and originary contexts.

The next twist to the overall plot comes when one looks beyond the pair of *Ecl.* 1 and 9 at the collection as a whole. Put on a broader basis and in virtue of such operations as the will-to-fragmentation and the interplay between "use" and "mention", it turns out that textuality's workings are not necessarily history-driven; rather the text of the *Eclogues* follows up and brings into sharper focus characteristic Theocritean and post-Theocritean practices—an effect further enhanced by a more 'Roman' and ideologically focused, with respect to Virgil's Greek intertexts, conceptualisation of such antonymic pairs as *negotium-otium* and *seria-ludus*, whose relation to the pair politics-poetics might be thought of as one of genus to species. And here, if anywhere, one might perhaps claim to put one's finger on some aspects of those complex and elusive processes that make Virgilian pastoral what it is—a high-definition (others would say strong⁶⁰) version of the Theocritean

⁶⁰ On weak and strong pastoral (or metapastoral) see Berger (1984) 2–5. Whether Theocritus is to be taken as an instance of relatively weak or relatively strong pastoral, it is their intensified self-reflexivity that makes the *Eclogues* an obviously "stronger" version of pastoral. Such self-reflexivity is bound to entail a measure of the generic criticism and self-criticism posited by Berger.

and post-Theocritean bucolic projects that draws, among other things, history and time as well as generic self-fashioning into its intensified textual operations.

How does this textuality relate to the general processes whereby poetic texts, especially those of the Hellenistic period and its Roman aftermath, intensify the network of reflexive modalities that show them increasingly aware of themselves as texts? Some of the operations I have been tracing, such as the interplay between what frames and what is being framed, have been associated with broader aspects of a post-classical and epigonal writing that are thought to evidence the changing perspectives of the author on both previous texts and social contexts.⁶¹ Also, certain versions of willed and “epideictic” fragmentarity have been claimed to relate to the Hellenistic poetics of “discontinuous and sophisticated lightness”.⁶² Yet there is a sense in which pastoral, more than any other poetic type, comes close to what we might see as a highly concentrated and neat dramatisation of such textualist hallmarks as the infinite potential of the sign for recontextualisation, citation, iteration and dissemination; it is prominently bent on juggling “realities” with their “constructed negatives”, and “referential seriousness” with mere “role-playing”; and it is unique in that through its agonistic structures and other specific fictions (shepherds singing each other’s songs and echoing their invisible masters) it reaches figuratively out to some of textuality’s more abstract outposts, such as the ever receding vistas of authorial presence and originary contexts. In all of these respects, the *Eclogues*, streamlining themselves into a more focused generic self-perception within the framework of a tightly organised poetic book and taking on far-reaching issues such as pastoral’s authorisation(s), history and temporality, occupy a position of central importance not only with regard to their Hellenistic background but also as previews of Augustan

⁶¹ “Framing” has had its fair share of critical and theoretical attention, and not only because of Derrida’s pronouncements on the subject. Goldhill’s (1991) 223–283 chapter on “framing, polyphony and desire” well substantiates his claim that “framing ... is both fundamental to pastoral poetics—and a fundamental source of the interpretative difficulties and the pleasures pastoral poetry provides” (p. 261). See esp. his remarks on the device of the song within a song as pointing to the “problematic status of writing poetry in the Hellenistic age” and the precariousness or impossibility of a unified poetic voice amid fragmentation and polyphony (236–246). Building on E.A. Schmidt’s important work and his cardinal concept of “poetische Reflexion”, Rumpf (1996) takes “Rahmung” to be the cornerstone of Virgil’s pastoral poetics.

⁶² See Goldhill (1991) 243.

poetic discourses preoccupied with writtenness, illusionism and absent presences.⁶³

And there is, of course, the related question that constantly underlies my argument, namely, the all too obvious tension between the ubiquitous fiction of pastoral orality on the one hand and the written basis of its textualist practices on the other. One way to generally account for this would be to place it in the broader context of “the illusions of presence” self-consciously evoked by the Hellenistic well-read Muse. A “grand narrative” lurks hereabouts, that of “the Fall of ancient culture from an original culture of orality and performance into a culture of the text, a Fall from the spoken into the written word”.⁶⁴ However, any residue of suchlike cultural anxiety by the time Virgil pens his *Eclogues* would be rather less significant than the possibility of treating orality and writtenness as variants manipulated by Virgil; in other words, if by the time the *Eclogues* were composed the written archive had grown more voluminous, what is the effect of this on the “necessary fiction” of orality these poems uphold?⁶⁵

For a possible answer one might do worse than look at *Ecl.* 9, the poem which more than any other celebrates sheer memory as the shepherds’ sole access to tradition, indeed as the sole way of rescuing this tradition from oblivion. Repeated acts of a memory hampered, endangered, incomplete, hectic and yet waning, serve to hammer home the importance of *memini* as, perhaps, the master trope for reflexive allusion in poetic discourses whose muse has long learned to write and peruse. In this sense, Lycidas and Moeris’ climactic exertions in mnemonics and on-the-spot oral delivery constitute a memorable charade acted out between complementary hyparchetypes deriving directly from master singer Menalcas’ scripted archetype—quite possibly, a case of arm-chair, second-degree cultural anxiety about the “Fall” or about post-

⁶³ Hardie (2002) broaches a number of these issues, or puts new perspectives on them, with regard to Ovid. Some of the points made in this wide-ranging study (especially those on the text as surrogate for physical presence, pastoral echo and plenitude, and the vicissitudes of “names” at the dizzy interface between referential reality on the one hand and linguistic play and textual etiolations on the other) seem to me pertinent to the *Eclogues*’ textualist strategies, even if Ovid’s metamorphic *carmen perpetuum* deploys them on a far different scale. See also below.

⁶⁴ See Hardie (2002) 22. For Don Fowler, quoted by Hardie here, ancient textuality “does not seek to recover any lost idyll [of orality] but rather to explore how the necessary fictions of that idyll interact with an awareness of its impossibility”.

⁶⁵ In his contribution to this volume, pp. 361–363, Breed has some pertinent remarks on this question.

performative loose ends; certainly, a heightened fiction which ironically elides a widening gap.⁶⁶ If, as Richard Hunter remarks,⁶⁷ the difference between the songs of Lycidas and Simichidas in *Id.* 7 suggests changes in poetic style linked to, among other things, the effects of writtenness, no Virgilian *Eclogue* can really be said to be informed by similar tensions. And we certainly need no Socrates to detect the manuscript under the pastoral cloak.

Not all readers will countenance a paradox that has history and politics disastrously trespassing on the pastoral space while at the same time figuratively confirming its textualist poetics; and with regard to *Ecl.* 9 in particular, it is obviously harder to tolerate a self-willed and maverick textuality nonchalantly pitting its airy paradox against the deep sense of crisis and pessimism the poem exudes. Indeed, any objection on this count would seem to have a lot going for it: Moeris and Lycidas' reverse, with respect to Theocritus' paradigmatic "Thalysia", journey from countryside to town; the (allegedly) darkening tones of the collection's second half; and the position of *Ecl.* 9 right before what is seen as an adieu to pastoral in the next poem—all of which are largely grounded on the assumption that the hostile forces win out and silence pastoral in the end. Against this, let me now, in this concluding part of my contribution, state the case, again from the standpoint of textuality, for the conflict being suspended rather than resolved at the expense of pastoral. I will start out from the conclusions of *Ecl.* 1 and 9, but the discussion will also take in similar moves in the concluding parts of other poems in the collection.

⁶⁶ Phaedrus, in the Platonic dialogue of that name, pretends an imperfect memory of a speech by Lysias when in fact he has been assiduously studying it in written form (227a–228e). But here Socrates will stop the charade in its tracks when he actually spies the manuscript Phaedrus has concealed under his cloak. The parallel is interesting in itself, but becomes very specific in the light of the importance of this dialogue for bucolic poetry (Phaedrus and Socrates will soon be gravitating to a seminal *locus amoenus* in 229a–230c); see Hunter (2003b) 233 with the references in n. 61. Further, it may be worth noting that Lycidas' ἐξεπύνασα in *Id.* 7.51 cannot readily be taken as referring to oral improvisation as it is the kind of term Hellenistic poets normally employ to suggest a well thought out composition.

⁶⁷ Hunter (2003b) 229–233.

5. *The sense of the ending(s)*

It is Tityrus who brings *Ecl.* 1 to a close with what has often been felt to be an overdue response to Meliboeus' plight, and what he says in ll. 79–83 has been abundantly celebrated as the quintessence of pastoral feeling for landscape:

*hic tamen hanc mecum poteras requiescere noctem
fronde super uiridi: sunt nobis mitia poma,
castaneae molles et pressi copia lactis,
et iam summa procul uillarum culmina fumant
maioresque cadunt altis de montibus umbrae.*

However, for tonight you could rest here with me upon green leafage: I can offer you ripe fruit and mealy chestnuts and abundance of milk cheese. Far off the roof-tops of the farms already smoke and down from the high mountains taller shadows fall.

Slanted in the light of my reading of *Ecl.* 1, the invitation tentatively extended in these verses represents a humanitarian gesture by someone who understands and acquiesces in the terms and deadlines of historical time: just for this night ... For Tityrus this is meant as a very ordinary night that will simply defer for a few hours Meliboeus' march to exile. And yet, this one night, with its ripe apples and chestnuts and generous supply of pressed cheese, all familiar (*nota*) to the same degree and in the same way as the cool streams praised by Meliboeus, seems pregnant with timeless possibilities. Just after Meliboeus has delivered his brief diatribe against civil dissension and exile in *Ecl.* 1.64–78, Tityrus (unwittingly, we might add, from the viewpoint of his dramatic presentation in the poem) offers him the chance to continue inhabiting a familiar discourse placed beyond the accidents of politics and historical time.⁶⁸ The morrow threatens with closure, but this one night stands a good chance of being expanded into the future continuous of a textuality that, like the vespertine calmness, contains both shepherds. Thus closure is deferred, tension remains and the evening half-light fittingly registers Meliboeus as an absent presence.

⁶⁸ *Hic tamen hanc mecum poteras requiescere noctem* ~ *Id.* 11.44 ἄδιον ἐν τῶντεῳ παρ' ἐμὶν τὰν νύκτα διαξειῖς; *fronde super uiridi* ~ *Id.* 7.132–133 ἐν τε βαθείας / ἄδειας σχοίνου χαμευνσίον ἐκλίνθημες / ἐν τε νεοτμάτοισι γεγαθότες οἶναγέοισι; *mitia poma* ~ *Ecl.* 1.37, 2.53, 7.54, 9.50; *castaneae* ~ *Ecl.* 2.52, 7.53; *pressi copia lactis* ~ *Id.* 11.35–37, 2.20, 3.6. Tityrus' invitation brings together and foregrounds items of the typical rustic fare but it also points to the idea of hospitable abundance in two prime Theocritean descriptions, *Id.* 7.131–158 and 11.36–48.

Nowhere is such absent presence more effectively dramatised than in *Ecl.* 9. While lamenting Menalcas' physical absence, Moeris and Lycidas through their singing seance conjure up Menalcas pure and simple, the sum total of fragments quoted beyond the limitations of original intention, occasion and historical time. Lycidas trusts these fragments' capacity for self-proliferation (*cantantes licet usque ... eamus*, l. 64); Moeris (ll. 51–55), pleading weariness and enfeebled memory, makes a double move: on the one hand, he resigns himself to the present circumstances and seeks to close off the singing process; on the other, he defers such closure by referring Lycidas to the prospect of Menalcas' full singing presence, and in doing so he employs the *saepe* word so emphatically involved in the reflexive modalities of Meliboeus' future continuous in *Ecl.* 1 (*sed tamen ista satis referet tibi saepe Menalcas*, "Menalcas, though, will sing them for you often enough", *Ecl.* 9.55). Is that just a red herring for a Lycidas growing importunate or evidence of Moeris' realisation that there can ultimately be no question of closure? Well, if Lycidas is as perceptive as he is impatient, he only has to remember what Moeris has just said in 9.51–52: *saepe ego longos / cantando memini me condere soles*, "I remember often in boyhood singing the long suns asleep". Moeris may plead forgetfulness now, but his insight that song is an infinite universe that can subsume even such cosmic units of measurement as the sun's daily course is much more important: even after the sun has sunk below the horizon, there is still that ever-receding horizon of more and more songs—and this is precisely what the two shepherds find out while reaching back for Menalcas. Physical absence, caused by history and much lamented at the dramatic level, is no closure. Once again, this eclogue pits the prospect of infinite pastoral discourse against the melancholy sense of an ending; and in its tantalising provisionality, *carmina tum melius, cum uenerit ipse, canemus*, "then, when himself has come, we'll sing songs all the better", represents an act of ultimate suspension.

In both *Ecl.* 1 and 9 the penumbras of nightfall lend colour to a closural hazard that primarily stems from history and politics; and in both the dimming light as the visual equivalent of pastoral's waning voice is shot through with the glimmer of discourse renewed. Nowhere is this closural stage-managing more spectacularly executed than at the conclusion of *Ecl.* 6 (ll. 84–86):

*ille canit, pulsae referunt ad sidera ualles;
cogere donec ouis stabulis numerumque referre
iussit et inuito processit Vesper Olympo.*

he sings (the smitten valleys tell it to the stars), till Vesper came to view in a reluctant sky and bade the flock be folded and their number told.

Silenus' (fragmentary) singing is still in full swing, reverberated by the pastoral valleys to the infinity of the firmament—a macrocosmic echoing which seems to deserve nothing less than the continuous, timeless future. Closure here is threatened not by history but by the pastoral chore of rounding up and counting the fold for which the half-light of the evening is the signal.⁶⁹ But can song on this cosmic scale be really controlled by the microcosmic units of the shepherds' routine? And can a *negotium*-frame ever be relied upon to contain it? The stage-managing defeats its own purpose: the revolution of the firmament that gives rise to Hesperus bespeaks both an end and a beginning in an ever recurrent, iterable pattern, and the sky (Olympus) which should be the limit is itself reluctant to accede to the unnaturalness of a *carmen interruptum*. The whole poem works to represent Silenus as a living universe of song, but *Ecl.* 6 is also special in that the tension between the infinite resources of pastoral discourse and the impending closure is played out in purely pastoral terms.

At first sight, the song of the shepherd Corydon for Alexis in *Ecl.* 2 runs up against a double closural hurdle, dusk (ll. 66–67) and the need to resume practical work (ll. 70–72). Although the (unattainable) object of Corydon's desire and the idea of erotic pursuit as such give the poem a distinct elegiac edge, the shepherd, as I have argued elsewhere, rather than going out of his pastoral way to persuade the beloved woos him in distinctly pastoral terms with a view to making him part and parcel of the pastoral experience.⁷⁰ In that sense Alexis is not so much an elegiac "out there" as the construct of a pastoral discourse which finds itself in tension with the cardinal elegiac strategy that will keep the beloved essentialised, hard to get or out of reach. Seen in this light, Alexis' urban-elegiac arrogance and disdain of the pastoral world represent the main closural threat to song. The threat is abetted by the lengthened shadows of the evening and the *negotium*-frame (both incorporated in Corydon's monologue) to be then qualified by the monologue's concluding line: *inuenies alium, si te hic fastidit, Alexin*, "if this Alexis sneers at you, you'll find another". *Inuenio-inuentio* is an appropriately loaded term that promises a renewed song and, more significantly, a renewed dis-

⁶⁹ On dusk as motif of closure in the *Eclogues* see Van Sickle (1984a).

⁷⁰ Papanghelis (1999) 47–48.

cursive construction centred round “another Alexis”. The verse has not been done justice to. In a world of essentialised entities, substantial dramatics and reality effects, “*alium Alexin*” is a common turn of expression meaning “another καλός, most probably by another name but most certainly every bit as worth wooing as Alexis”. This is not Corydon’s world. “*alium Alexin*” posits no change of name because it already shows the boy on the way to becoming an iterable citation beyond the accidents of his elegiac essence; to be sure Alexis is an interneer of quotation marks from the very start, only the quotation marks are now beginning to close further in on the interneer, and what is announced at the very end of *Ecl.* 2 will presently be delivered in the form of fragments and snippets.⁷¹ Once again, what Theocritus set rolling with εὐρησέῃς Γαλάτειαν ἴσως καὶ καλλίον’ ἄλλαν, “may be you will find another and more beautiful Galatea” (*Id.* 11.76) gathers textualist momentum with Virgil. The Theocritean line has been purposefully transposed to mark the end it denies. The unresponsive boy, evening and the chore at hand are all there, but real closure is nowhere in sight—at least not yet.

Elegy turns out in force with the figure of Gallus in *Ecl.* 10. Famously monumentalised in a Daphnis-like posture amid the Arcadians, this dyed-in-the-wool elegiac figure comes as close as an alien can to understanding the implications of pastoral textuality, for if his Lycoris is represented as the sweet elegiac incubus that weighs him down to the circumstances and accidents of elegiac monogamy, his hectic fantasy of a non-committal alternation among the familiar “Phyllises”, “Amyntases” & Co makes him a buoy set adrift on pastoral discourse; and when, almost as an afterthought, he budes up to make room for Lycoris too, it is probably with a view to increasing the range of the floating signifiers that will keep the elegiac *Amor* at bay. Indeed, he gives proof of having graduated to the mysteries of full-blown pastoral textuality as his wish to be sung of by the Arcadians means having his elegiac integrity broken down into fragments cited, echoed and disseminated by those

⁷¹ A citational and iterable “Alexis” would not be much different from the Amaryllis that resonates through the woods of the contented Tityrus in *Ecl.* 1, and Hardie’s (2002) 121–128 sharp distinction between “pastoral plenitude and presence” in *Ecl.* 1 and “elegiac lack and absence” in *Ecl.* 2 needs to be revised in this light. To put it another way: Hardie’s “pastoral plenitude and presence” can be reconceptualised as the function of a pastoral textuality that staunchly asserts itself against absence and closure, elegiac or otherwise. But then, Hardie himself (pp. 130–132 and 241) shows well how the plenitude and presences of the pastoral genre are liable to deconstruction.

typical sounding-boards, the Arcadian mountainsides.⁷² But *Amor* somehow cracks down on this, and Gallus realises that, after all, he is not prepared to lose his chains, Lycoris and all, in exchange for becoming a fragment and an echo reverberating down the future continuous. Eventually, *omnia uincit Amor*—including, it seems, pastoral textuality.

Gallus concedes closure. Does the friendly and loving voice that sings of him concede it too (ll. 75–77)?

*surgamus: solet esse grauis cantantibus umbra,
iuniperi grauis umbra ; nocent et frugibus umbrae.
ite domum saturae, uenit Hesperus, ite capellae.*

Let us arise: for singers heavy is the shade, heavy the shade of juniper; and shade harms fruit. Go, little she-goats, Hesper comes, go home replete.

Although *umbra* is now expressly said to be growing harmful for the singer, *umbra* and *Hesperus* have proved less than hermetically closural on previous occasions, and it is just possible that *surgamus* may be a conundrum about ends that are also beginnings.⁷³ But Gallus concedes closure as an unreformed elegist who cannot embrace the full implications of his textualist quarter of an hour. Had he been able or allowed to do so, he would have known that a fully unrolled papyrus is at once the most palpable and the most uncertain of all closures.⁷⁴

⁷² I have made the same point, in more detail and from a slightly different perspective, in Papanghelis (1999) 57–58.

⁷³ See Theodorakopoulos (1997) 163.

⁷⁴ For comments on an earlier draft of this paper I am indebted to audiences in Berlin and Cambridge, and to Marco Fantuzzi, Philip Hardie and Brian Breed.

MUSIC FOR MONSTERS:
OVID'S *METAMORPHOSES*, BUCOLIC EVOLUTION,
AND BUCOLIC CRITICISM

ALESSANDRO BARCHIESI

Ovidian epic promises what is potentially important evidence about the evolution of the bucolic genre after Virgil. The setting is a propitious one. After the instant success of the *Eclogues*, and while Theocritus as well as Moschus and Bion were still important poetic voices in Rome, bucolics must have been accepted, for the first time in the Western tradition, as an institutionalized genre. On the other hand, Ovid is the quintessential 'post-generic' poet: his epic presupposes a fully formed system of genres, substantially the very system that would be canonized and transmitted to the European tradition. The *Metamorphoses* constitute an encyclopaedia of genres and so (implicitly) of literary criticism. It is not by chance that Ovid is the first important Roman author who does not construct (implicitly or explicitly) his own work, programme, or persona, as the repetition of an individual *Greek* model (whether the new Menander, Homer, Theocritus, Hesiod, Callimachus, Alcaeus, Aratus, Apollonius and so on). This is surely because he will be competing with all of them and more—and also because by now, in Augustan Rome, it would make even more sense to be appraised as the 'new Tibullus' or the 'new Virgil'. An equally important point (related to the previous one) is that, when the *Metamorphoses* were composed and published, Virgil had already been constructed as a model of a *poetic career*. This factor has consequences for the evolution of the pastoral genre. The career model is based upon the 'ascendant' and 'rising' pattern, and the effect is predicated on a growing sense that a natural hierarchy of genres exists, and that pastoral is in many ways the right way to start before 'upgrading' oneself to the next level. (Some features of traditional bucolic poetry are now especially important, because they function as badges of 'humility': the positioning of shepherds in the social hierarchy of labour; elements of style; the brevity, lightness, humour, variety and sexual innuendo of the poems; the country/city opposition, which for a Roman entails the Supercity

of Rome as a counterweight to idyllic *rusticitas*¹). Two more factors, concomitant but not secondary, are that Virgilian pastoral must, by 8 AD, have already been the object of teaching, parody, and scholarship, and that Theocritean exegesis of the kind we still have access to in the scholastic tradition is, we may presume, already in place. Therefore, the ‘constructive’, system-oriented practice observed by Greek interpreters of Theocritus² is now at work in both languages: the tradition of saying “this is really bucolic”, “this detail needs interpretation as belonging to the world of the shepherds” and so on must be based on reading practices that were already available by the time of Ovid, both in Greek and in Latin.³

However, in the first sentence of this paper, the word “evidence” coupled with “Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*” must have been enough to generate immediate disbelief, and the following sentences have served as an invocation of mitigating circumstances. For everyone knows that Ovid’s poem is not an encyclopaedia of genres, unless one likes unruly encyclopaedias where lemmata are contested by their own definitions and entries tend to bleed into each other. The poem is not a witness to a system of shared generic expectations: it is a participant (and a cheating, tricky one at that) in a shifting conversation about generic norms and their validity: at every turn and twist, we can expect a reassertion of conventions, or a defamiliarizing effect, or a spoof. Think about the relationship between epic and bucolic as it is established at the level of reader reception in this work: in many cases the allusion can be interpreted as a pointer to similarity or difference between genres; more difficult still, it might mean that epic and bucolic are compatible, or fundamentally alien to each other; even worse, it could imply that believing in generic essences is a useless task, since both epic and bucolic are impure and even illusory ideas.

We will have to proceed with some caution. To make sure that my examples have some specific relevance, I will stick to episodes in which we can easily recognize not just some pastoral detail, allusion, or

¹ A word, we should remember, never attested before Ovid (*Am.* 1.8.4, etc.).

² Cf. Fantuzzi’s contribution to this volume, pp. 235ff.

³ Numitorius’ *Antibucolica* (*FLP* p. 284) is often accused of having been a silly and pedantic spoof, but when Numitorius targets the expression *cuicum pecus*, “who owns the flock?” (*Ecl.* 3.1) and its Latinity he may well be drawing attention to the specifics of a bucolic ‘alternative world’, in full awareness of Greek learned discussions of Theocritus: that bit of Virgilian *rusticitas* is in fact a sophisticated play on a Theocritean model, as demonstrated by Wills (1993).

scenery, but more specifically a thematic, narrative reference to pastoral song.⁴ I should mention, therefore, that I am willingly discarding a much larger area of enquiry, and a potentially fruitful one, since some of the best studies of *Metamorphoses* have recognized that a certain representation of landscape, typical of Ovidian epic, owes much to the tradition of Theocritus and the *Eclogues*, and in fact constructs that tradition as something akin to our modern notion of “idyllic”, if only for the purpose of building up disruptive tensions, based on violence, lust, and humiliation.⁵ By limiting my discussion to the three episodes where bucolic song, and not only bucolic landscape, is foregrounded, I hope to find a counterbalance to the notorious difficulty of pinning down generic matrices in this unstable epic of love and changes. It should also be possible to ascertain a precise awareness in Ovid of how these two elements had been most often coherently combined in Theocritus’ poetics of the bucolic world (= bucolics was not just felt as the poetry of irenic landscapes and pastoral characters).⁶

The three episodes⁷ are as follows:

(i) Mercury, sent by Jupiter to Argolis in order to dispatch the guardian Argus and to rescue Io, who is being detained in bovine form, disguises himself as a goatherd, and lures Argus to sleep with a song. The theme is the origin of the panpipes, the very instrument Mercury plays to Argus. It is the story of how, in Arcadia, Pan tried to rape the nymph Syrinx, and just before he could catch her, the fleeing nymph was

⁴ This approach is not dissimilar to the choice operated on the vast corpus of Nonnan epic by Harries in this volume, and there are in fact similarities with Ovid, since in the *Dionysiaca* we find watered down influences of bucolic *settings* and natural representations, but also a recurring tendency to recreate bucolic *song* in contexts of illusion, delusion, deceit and impending outbreaks of violence.

⁵ Segal (1969); Hinds (2002) are the two landmarks in this panorama; cf. Schiesaro in this volume on dangerous *loca amoena* in Seneca as well as Ovid.

⁶ On the ‘programmatic’ link between nature and the ‘rustic music’ as the two key features of Theocritus’ bucolic *locus amoenus*, see Theocr. 1.1–3, with Hunter (1999) 69–70.

⁷ The three crucial discussions for my purposes are respectively Hardie (2002) 130–133 (see also Hardie (2003) on the importance of impersonators and simulation); Kenney (1986) xxvii (on genre hierarchy); Farrell 1992b (on generic impurity: I should have used this important paper in my own account of recent approaches to genre, Barchiesi (2001b); but the first episode has generated a considerable amount of important comments in Konstan (1991), Griffin (1999), Murgatroyd (2001), Fabre-Serris (2003), Hardie (2003). More details on this episode in my commentary to books 1–2 of the poem (Barchiesi (2005a) *ad loc.*). On the third episode see the excellent commentary by Hopkinson (2000).

changed into reeds: by chance, Pan's panting breath echoes in the reeds, and so the panpipes were invented. Before Mercury completes the song, Argus falls asleep and is immediately beheaded by the god's scythe (1.664–723).

(ii) Midas, the gold-crazy king of the Phrygians, sobers up and lowers his profile by attaching himself to Pan and his natural way of life. Proud of his musical skills, Pan boldly challenges Apollo the citharist. The contest is arbitrated by Mount Tmolus: he immediately proclaims the artistic superiority of Apollo's lyre over Pan's pipes. Yet Midas, a fan of Pan's performance, criticizes the verdict. In retaliation Apollo gives the king the ears of an ass. Midas hides them under a tiara, but the barber, who is in the know, whispers the secret into a ditch, and lo! a reed-bed is born there and the buried secret is now a message in the wind (11.146–192).

(iii) The Sicilian nymph Galatea tells her fellow nymph Scylla the story of her erotic persecution by the Cyclops Polyphemus. The Cyclops in love performed a song of wooing and lament that Galatea used to listen to while sheltered in a cave in the arms of his rival, the handsome youth Acis. Polyphemus, crazed with jealousy, spots them and crushes Acis under a massive rock: by a miracle engineered by the compassionate Galatea, Acis reappears as the homonymous river-god from under the seaside crag, identical in beauty, his new identity marked by horns and a crown of reeds (13.750–898).

I will try to tease out some general implications of each episode for the 'background perception' of the bucolic genre, under the three rubrics of (i) appropriation and impersonation, (ii) hierarchy, and (iii) *auxesis*, but first let me select a few details that function as connections between the three narratives in the order of their appearance. As we shall see, the stories are connected by the presence of the essential god of pastoral, Pan; their respective locations in Arcadia, Phrygia, Sicily are interesting (cf. below n. 11); and the cumulative effect is a continuous line from aetiology (i) to humiliation (ii) and finally to a rise of the genre beyond its own traditional limits (iii). The Ovidian poem tells the origins of bucolic song, how it became too ambitious and was put in its place, and how it ended up (in a specifically Roman version) transgressing its borders.

It becomes legitimate to compare traditional pastoral and Ovidian pastoral. One surprise, in general, is that in Ovidian pastoral it is

difficult to find one single ‘regular’ character: no shepherd is just a shepherd; all the characters are monstrous or portentous actors (the god Hermes in disguise, the half-goat god Pan, the barbarian freak of nature Polyphemus) as well as strange audiences (the hundred-eyed Argus; Mount Tmolus with trees on his ears, and with him the satrap and asinine Midas; the monster-to-be Scylla). Reciprocally, whenever the poem introduces regular, legitimate shepherds, there is no musical or poetic dimension to their lives.⁸ In the first episode, to be sure, nobody is as he or she seems: even the cow who is the focal point for the hundred eyes of the *boukolos* is, in fact, a metamorphosed girl. Impersonation and substitution are the rule. Now, we can of course simplify our reactions by saying that this is, after all, a poem of wondrous transformations, and a poem obsessed with simulation, doubling, and spuriousness.⁹ Yet if we keep an eye on the institutions of the bucolic genre, we might also decide to read this series of anomalies as a coherent comment on the conventions of bucolics: the conventions that enable readers to accept the appeal of the melodious reality of the pastoral world and yet to question its truth—hence the important habit of fantasizing about bucolic masks and aliases. In Ovid, there is little doubt that bucolics is a masquerade,¹⁰ and that simulation creates the natural world of song.

⁸ Apollo does continue the tradition of Pan’s *fistula*, but only when he *impersonates* a shepherd and lover (in the Admetos myth, 2.680–685). Daphnis the archetype of musical shepherds is sidetracked in 4.276–277 (*vulgatos taceo ... pastoris amores / Daphnidis Idaei*, “I will pass by the well-known love of Daphnis of Mount Ida”). We should contrast Battus, who has a regular pastoral name but no interest in song (2.687–707); the Apulian shepherds, who inhabit Pan’s cave in Italy, but perform only rustic and aggressive imitations of the musical and rhythmic dance of the Nymphs: the episode sounds like a commentary on the contrast between Greek song-and-dance tradition and Italic *asperitas* and *rusticitas*, leading to satire and fescennine, not to bucolic melody (14.514–526). Those and all the other human herdsmen mentioned in the poem are extraneous to the world of song.

⁹ Another specific and general link with Nonnus: in his work simulation and identity theft are often defined as ‘spuriousness’, an interesting concept since the *Dionysiaca* is also a poem about strange and deviant procreation. So for example book one features a Zeus νόθος, “bastard” (295), a Cadmus who is a νόθος νομεύς, “sham herdsman” (373), ψευδαλέος ... βοτήρ, “counterfeit herdsman” (376), and the usurper Typhoeus called νόθος ποιμήν, “sham herdsman” (521) and αντίτυπος ... ποιμήν, “feigned herdsman” (423–424). On the use of pastoral in the Typhoeus/Cadmos episode see Harries in this volume, pp. 517–523, and also Hardie (2005).

¹⁰ Note that Hunter’s contribution to this volume discusses the impossibility of separating ‘pure’ bucolics (in Theocritus and Virgil) from reading conventions based on ‘masquerade’ and aliases.

Before we come to a more episodic discussion, one general point is still needed: all three episodes feature not just inset narrative (a standard feature in Ovidian epic), but more particularly inset song/music; all three culminate in the emergence of the most bucolic of features of a natural landscape,¹¹ the reed (*harundo* or *calamus*), ready to become the bucolic instrument *par excellence*.

... *Panaque, cum prensam sibi iam Syringa putaret,
corpore pro nymphae calamos tenuisse palustres,
dumque ibi suspirat, motos in harundine ventos
effecisse sonum tenuem similemque querenti.
arte nova vocisque deum dulcedine captum
"hoc mihi colloquium tecum" dixisse "manebit",
atque ita disparibus calamis compagine cerae
inter se iunctis nomen posuisse¹² puellae. (1.705–712)*

(it remained to relate) how Pan, when now he thought he had caught Syrix, instead of her held nothing but marsh reeds in his arms; and while he sighed in disappointment, the soft air stirring in the reeds gave forth a low and complaining sound. Touched by this wonder and charmed by the sweet tones, the god exclaimed: "This exchange, at least, shall I have with you". And so he gave the name of the girl to the pipes, made of unequal reeds fitted together by a joining of wax.

*creber harundinibus tremulis ibi surgere lucus
coepit et, ut primum pleno maturuit anno,
prodidit agricolam: leni nam motus ab austro
obruta verba refert dominique coarguit aures. (11.190–193¹³)*

¹¹ Do we have connected reasons, and programmatic effects, for the locations of the three bucolic episodes? In the Argus story, the inset song about Pan is located in Arcadia, a traditional dwelling and cultic area for the god, but also the one reinvented by Virgil as the home of a guild of singers (on the complexities of Arcadia in the *Eclogues* see Kennedy (1987), with rich bibliography); Tmolus is not to the best of my knowledge a very pastoral place: it may be significant that before Ovid it is the location of another famous competition, laurel *vs* olive tree in Callim. *Ia*. 4 (in Callimachus, given the fabulistic style of that poem, the choice is possibly linked to the neighbouring (Ov. *Met.* 11.152) city of Sardis as birthplace of Aesopus, cf. *Ia*. 2, fr. 192.15–16 Pfeiffer). A Polyphemus story must of course happen in the traditional location, near Aetna, but the location has added edge because now the *avena pastoris Siculi*, "reed-pipe of the Sicilian herdsman" (a reference to the Theocritean model in *Ecl.* 10.51) is being toted by Polyphemus in person, a character from Theocritus ("our compatriote", Theocr. 11.7), a Sicilian shepherd transformed by Virgil and later by Ovid into a stabilized 'aetiological' symbol of pastoral origins.

¹² *posuisse* Tarrant; *tenuisse* mss.

¹³ Cf. 11.171 *Pana iubet Tmolus citharae submittere cannas*, "Tmolus ordered Pan to lower his reeds before the lyre".

but a thick growth of whispering reeds began to spring up there, and these, when at the year's end they came to their full size, they repeated his buried words and exposed the story of his master's ears.

... *tum moles iacta dehiscit,*
*vivaeque per rimas proceraque surgit **harundo**,*
osque cavum saxi sonat exsultantibus undis,
miraeque res, subito media tenus exstitit alvo
*incinctus iuvenis flexis nova cornua **cannis**. (13.890–894)*

then the mass that had been thrown cracked wide open and a tall reed sprang up alive through the crack, and the hollow opening in the rock resounded with leaping waters, and, wonderful! suddenly a youth stood forth waist-deep from the water, his new-sprung horns wreathed with bending rushes.

In all cases, the *harundo* is connected to natural acoustic phenomena, a sort of vocalisation of the landscape (through wind, or an echoing cave); in all cases, the botanic *mirabile dictu*, while forming the metamorphic coda to a narrative sequence, is preceded by a specific reference to the use of reeds as musical instruments for bucolic song: cf. 1.683–684 *iunctisque canendo ... harundinibus*, “making music on his pipe of joined reeds”¹⁴ (cf. 1.711–712 *atque ita disparibus calamis compagine cerae / inter se iunctis ...*, “and so the pipes, made of unequal reeds fitted together by a joining of wax”); 11.154 *et leve cerata modulatur harundine carmen*, “(Pan) plays light songs upon his reeds close joined with wax”; 13.784 *sumptaue harundinibus compacta est fistula centum*, “(the Cyclops) took his pipe made of a hundred reeds” (always with the choice of *harundines*, the most appropriate if one wants to align bucolic song with the natural landscape of a reed-bed). In the final instance, the reed is even “alive”: 13.891 *viva ... surgit harundo*, “the reed sprang up alive”. One could, of course, argue that here the presence of ‘closural’ reeds is less relevant to the bucolic atmosphere than it was in the previous two examples, because they would be the normal paraphernalia of a water deity. To this I would object that on the one hand the river Acis is mentioned in a significant passage of Theocritus’ *Id.* 1 (l. 69), and so the episode ends up contributing to the ideal landscape of bucolic music, Eastern Sicily, its eagerly awaited best source of water; on the other hand, Acis is not just a (born again) river, but the offspring (13.750) of a fluvial nymph and of Faunus, the Italian equivalent of Pan. The symbolism of reeds

¹⁴ Of course in the Argus story the pipe has a traditional function; cf. Aesch. *Prom.* 575 and Barchiesi (2005a) *ad loc.* on the Ovidian text and its models.

is thus doubly motivated. Like Syrinx, Acis is fittingly represented *post mortem* by a sudden efflorescence of *harundines*.

In the first instance, in particular, the musical technology of reeds precedes and ‘creates’ (by narrating, that is) their natural appearance, which in itself (circularly) is the aetiology of the panpipe: without Hermes’ panpipe we would not know how Pan (that is, a random encounter between metamorphosis, nature, and desire—and a compromise between Lucretian physiology and mythological imagination¹⁵) created the panpipe out of a thicket of marshland reeds (and were *harundines* around before the metamorphosis of Syrinx? We are not told, as often in the poem, whether one metamorphosis is supposed to account for the first appearance and aetiology of a whole class of natural objects. In fact the previous ‘technological’ breakthrough by a god in the narrative of book 1 is also an *harundo*, the reed-and-lead arrow of Cupid back in 1, 471). Bucolic art is the only way to know how art has been created out of nature; sophistication precedes and (re)creates the bucolic naive; a malicious impersonator gives us access to the original invention of bucolics, and the inventor turns out to be his son—this inversion of effects and causes being the essence of bucolic chic.

The systematic reference to *fistula* and *harundines* presupposes¹⁶ the importance of references to musical reeds in Virgil as genre-markers. *Calamus*, *harundo* (besides *fistula* and *cicuta* and *avena*) in fact have an impressive record in the *Eclogues*, striking even if one considers the traditional use of σῦριγξ, κάλαμος, and δόναξ in the Greek bucolic and epigrammatic poets: *Ecl.* 1.10 *calamo ... agresti*, “on the rustic pipe”, 6.8 *agrestem tenui meditabor harundine Musam*, “now will I practise the rustic Muse” (cf. *calamus*, 2.32, 34; 3.13; 5.2, 48; 6.8, 69; 8.24; *avena*, 1.2; 10.51, with *Ov. Met.* 1.677; cf. 8.192).¹⁷

¹⁵ On the interpretation of 1.707 *dumque ibi suspirat*, “while he sighed in disappointment”, see Cameron (2004) 302—but I must caution that Pan is also believed to have invented masturbation: Dio Chrys. *Or.* 6.20.

¹⁶ In his posthumous work on the imagery of the book in ancient poetry, forthcoming Oxford UP, Don Fowler points out that long before those references became programmatic for the ‘live’ musical atmosphere there was a regular technology of *writing* based on ‘reeds’, the reed-pen, *calamus*, being attested in this sense since Plautus and Cato, although *harundo* not before Persius (3.11). Then of course it becomes relevant that the σῦριγξ is a combination of two important elements in the technology of writing, the *calamus* and the wax. As it is practiced by Virgil, bucolics is a genre that invokes *writing* as its foundational medium, precisely when it foregrounds ‘live music’ as its ideal content.

¹⁷ One easily understands that it is important for Virgil’s native river, the Mincius, to be so densely populated with “slender reeds”, cf. *Ecl.* 7.12–13 *hic uiridis tenera praetexit*

1. *Appropriation, Impersonation*

The Argus episode is the first in the long poem where we can easily identify bucolic resonances. Considering that this is an epic poem *posing* for a while as a pastoral text, it is entirely fitting that at the outset we see Mercury *impersonating* a shepherd (1.674–677):

*desilit in terras; illic tegumenque removit
et posuit pennas, tantummodo virga retenta est:
hac agit, ut pastor, per devia rura capellas,
dum venit, abductas, et structis cantat avenis.*

(Mercury) removes his cap and lays aside his wings. Only his wand he keeps. With this, in the character of a shepherd, through the sequestered country paths he drives a flock of goats which he has rustled as he came along, and plays upon his reed-pipe as he goes.

Some standard attributes are lost in this transition from epic to pastoral: the magic wand alone remains, since it is needed as a pastoral *baculum*: we are not told about another epic instrument, the curved blade that will pop up later in the episode, and only for the killing. It is also important that, being a god of theft, Mercury appropriates the goats with casual spontaneity: the speed of *agit ... capellas dum venit abductas*, “he drives a flock of goats which he has rustled as he came along”, expresses not only the nonchalance of the god, but also the typical Ovidian velocity of the shift from epic to a different genre. In fact, the question of the ‘ownership’ of flocks had already been used by Virgil as an important pointer to issues of ‘control’ over literary predecessors. The question that opens *Ecl.* 3, *cuium pecus*, “who owns the flock?” should be read as a meta-literary pointer to the appropriation, or *furtum*, of a Theocritean model,¹⁸ and a witty anticipation of unavoidable controversies over Theocritean ‘thefts’.

harundine ripas / Mincius, “here Mincius fringes his green banks with slender reeds”. The Mincius is mentioned once in every Virgilian poem, always with accompanying *harundo*, but at growing degrees of separation from bucolic atmosphere; at *G.* 3.14–15 *tardis ingens ubi flexibus errat / Mincius et tenera praetexit harundine ripas*, “where great Mincius wanders in lazy windings and fringes his banks with slender reeds”, the river is *ingens*, “great”, fittingly since it is the setting for the epic temple in honor of Octavian, but still has slender reeds, and at *Aen.* 10.205–206 the river is now the figurehead of a warship, its *harundo* not *tenera*, “slender”, but *glauca*, “gleaming”, and sailing the open sea.

¹⁸ For this approach see Henderson (1998a) 236–238; for a similar approach to land ownership in the *Eclogues*, see Hunter’s contribution to this volume. On the Greek model for *cuium pecus* see above, n. 3.

If we continue to focus on perceptions of the bucolic genre as a horizon for this episode, it becomes significant that the narrative outcome depends on Argus *falling asleep*. When Argus invites the shepherd Mercury to enjoy some relax with him (1.679–681):

... “at tu,
quisquis es, hoc poteris mecum considerare saxo”,
*Argus ait, “neque enim pecori fecundior ullo
 herba loco est, aptamque vides pastoribus umbram”.*

“You, there”, Argos calls, “whoever you are, you might as well sit beside me on this rock; for nowhere is there richer grass for the flock, and you see that there is shade convenient for shepherds”.

his language not only presupposes a very Virgilian¹⁹ theory of pastoral *umbra*, but also replays the invitation to rest uttered by Tityrus at the end of Virgil’s *Ecl.* 1 (l. 79):

Hic tamen hanc mecum poteris requiescere noctem.

Yet this night you might have rested here with me on the green leafage.

The witty point of the allusion is that Argus as a shepherd is interested in rest and shade, but not, unlike all the conventional shepherds, in sleep: his eyes are always wide open. Ironically, Mercury will turn the relaxing properties of pastoral style against him, when an easy alternative is at hand: he is the very god who presides over slumbering, the one who always has a sleep-inducing wand (the contradiction is highlighted at 1.735–736, when the wand is used merely to ‘intensify’ the sleep already started by the pastoral song).

When Mercury achieves his aim of Argus dozing off, we have on the one hand an intensification of the main positive value of bucolics—quiet, now transvalued into something soporific—and on the other hand, an echo of many important passages of pastoral poetry where sleep is programmatically praised as a beneficent, sound-provoked quality of idyllic country-places. Virgil explicitly compares the pleasure of poetry to the pleasure of sleep *en plein air*, and connects the music of nature with the music of humans. In *Ecl.* 5 music/song is as pleasant as a nap on the grass (ll. 45–46):

*Tale tuum carmen nobis, diuine poeta,
 quale sopor fessis in gramine ...*

¹⁹ Note the influential emphasis of Clausen (1994) xxv: “it was Virgil who introduced shade and shadows into the pastoral landscape”.

Your lay, heavenly bard, is to me even as sleep on the grass to the weary ...

In *Ecl.* 1, bucolic happiness is represented through the sleep-inducing properties of natural *susurrus* (ll. 51–55):

*fortunate senex, hic inter flumina nota
et fontis sacros frigus captabis opacum;
hinc tibi, quae semper, uicino ab limite saepes
Hyblaeis apibus florem depasta salicti
saepe leui somnum suadebit inire susurro.*

Happy old man! Here, amid familiar streams and sacred springs, you shall enjoy the cooling shade. On this side, as of old, on your neighbour's border, the hedge whose willow blossoms are sipped by Hybla's bees shall often with its gentle hum soothe you to slumber.

The convergence of relaxation, song, and natural sounds is also important in programmatic texts by Meleager, who was particularly influential in Rome,²⁰ and of course in the Theocritean and Meleagrian incipit of the *Eclogues*. Bucolic poetry, Ovid suggests, is by convention walking a thin line between 'laid back' and boring.²¹

2. *Hierarchy*

If we discount the overtones of boredom, the ending of our first story seems to promise a bright future for the evolution of bucolics, but our next episode, the competition between lyre and pipe in the story of Midas in book XI, reveals the possibility of decline. The fascination here is less triumphal: not Argus' eyes, but the proverbially less-than-reliable ears of Midas are the only sensors taken with this kind of music. The reeds of Pan surrender to the un-bucolic lyre of Apollo. One sensitive reader of Ovid and Virgil, Calpurnius Siculus, seems to have sensed a potential for subversion in this hierarchy: cf. Calpurn.

²⁰ Cf. the epigrams on the grasshopper (*AP* 7.195 = *HE* 4058ff.) and the cicada (*AP* 7.196 = *HE* 4066ff.), both centered on song and sleep (cf. Gutzwiller (1998) 318–319 and Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 177–178), and very influential on Virgil.

²¹ Cf. the familiar argument that Argus yields to sleep exactly when Mercury is going to replay what is for the Ovidian reader an already too familiar ending, very similar to the ending of the Daphne story, and repetition at close range is going to generate boredom: so when the tale, and Argus' head, are cut off, the principle of variation typical of *Metamorphoses* carries the day (see, e.g., Konstan (1991)).

4.65–66 ... *et qui posset avena / praesonuisse chelyn*, “and one who could on the reed-pipe outplay the lyre”.²² But he, of course, had a conflict of interests.

It is fair to say, as a first impression, that the contest of Pan and Apollo is not one of those traditional bucolic contests in which it is notoriously difficult to find a rationale for victory and defeat. This may, at least in part, be because in Ovid the competition is slightly unconventional from the very start. The culture of Greek *mousike* was based almost entirely on agonistic performances,²³ but who ever heard of direct competition for an award between a citharist and a pipe-player? The Athenian Panathenaia, to quote just one conspicuous example, had separate prizes for the *aulos*, *cithara*, rhapsodes, etc. (e.g. *IG* II².2311 col. i). On the other hand, the rules of the contest in Phrygia are not particularly unfair or suspicious. Tmolus as umpire is not criticized in the narrative,²⁴ and if one thinks of two related stories of artistic competitions between gods and lesser gods or humans as told by Ovid, the atmosphere here is more professional and less hysterical or cruel. The competition of Athena with the weaver Arachne from Hypaepa (“modest” *Hypaepa*, 6.13, mentioned again as a locale under the highlands of Tmolus where Pan and Apollo compete, 11.152: the name itself indicates a lower elevation) ends up with Arachne undefeated, and therefore Athena tears her tapestry to pieces, beats her, and transforms her into the basest and lowliest of weavers, the spider. The flute competition between Marsyas and Apollo (often assumed to be related to the ill-attested match of Apollo and Pan in our episode) is, as narrated by Ovid, a short auletic prologue to the real event, the skinning of one contender by the other (6.384–385). In both situations, we dispense with referees and formalities. In the Midas episode, on the contrary, there is no need for violence and suffering: the confrontation quietly takes for granted that lyric has more authority than pastoral music. Pan of all

²² Other indications that Calpurnius combines Virgil with Ovidian ‘revisionist bucolics’: Midas as a shepherd-umpire in *Ecl.* 4, and the inversion of 11.154 *leve carmen*, “light song”, in 2.30 *non leve carmen*, “text of no light import” (see Magnelli’s contribution to this volume, pp. 472–473).

²³ Griffith (1990) 185–207.

²⁴ The story as Ovid tells it (and we do not have a control on previous tradition, since it is not attested anywhere else before ps.-Hyginus) is not fully comparable to the pattern of biased and unfair judgments discussed by Griffith (1990) 190, and in his important paper Mark Griffith slightly misrepresents the facts in Ovid to have him fit the general paradigm of un-straightforward contests (“Midas, the ‘official’ judge, prefers Pan’s song”).

people should have known better. Not only is he a humbler god than Apollo, he is also the one who famously paid homage to the greatest of lyric composers, Pindar the disciple of Apollo, by performing Pindar's *Hymn to Pan*: the story is evoked in the following epigram by Antipater (*AP* 16.305 = *GPh* 487ff.), who mentions that the lyre rises above all instruments, and that Pan accepted the superiority of lyric and forgot about his pastoral reeds:

Νεβρείων ὅποσον σάλπιγξ ὑπερίαχεν αὐλῶν,
 τόσσον ὑπὲρ πάσας ἔκραγε σείο χέλυσ,
 οὐδὲ μάτην ἀπαλοῖς ξουθὸς περὶ χεῖλεσιν ἑσμός
 ἔπλασε κηρόδετον, Πίνδαρε, σείο μέλι.
 μάρτυς ὁ Μαινάλιος κερόεις θεὸς ὕμνον ἀείσας
 τὸν σείο καὶ νομίῳ λησάμενος δονάκων.

As much as the trumpet outpeals the fawn-bone flute, so much does your lyre outring all others. It was not idly, Pindar, that that swarm of bees fashioned the honeycomb about your tender lips. I call to witness the horned god of Maenalus, who chanted one of your hymns and forgot his reed-pipe.

The only situation I know of when a pastoral hero claims to have defeated the lyre of Apollo is the treacherous, ridiculous, boasting speech by Cadmus, the faux-shepherd of Nonnus (*Dion.* 1.399–400): there Cadmus, who is actually a pipe-player instructed by Pan, uses an *ad hoc* invention to fool Typhon,²⁵ because he needs the sinews of Zeus to re-string (he says) his lyre. It is also relevant that the Ovidian Apollo is, in the Midas episode, almost his own statue as a Citharoedus (cf. 11.169 *artificis status ipse fuit*): a Roman audience would have recognized this as the iconography of the Scopadean Apollo, the one revered in the temple of Apollo Palatinus next to the house of the Apolline leader Augustus. The victory of Apollo is thus over-determined: the competition is, so to speak, polygeneric; the winner capitalizes on political authority as well as musical superiority; the judge Tmolus is, by definition, a high mountain, perhaps superficially promising for the mountain-loving Pan, and he even has *silvae* (11.164), but is naturally supportive of 'high' *vs* 'low'.

As if to seal the verdict with an objective disproportion, the Ovidian narrative of Pan's song highlights at least two weaknesses. While the iconography of Apollo is Panhellenic, international, and therefore also

²⁵ Hardie (2005) 123–125 on numerous metamorphoses of bucolic song in the episode.

Roman, Pan ‘goes Phrygian’, and presumably tailors his song on his fan Midas (11.161–163): *calamis agrestibus insonat ille / barbaricoque Midan ... carmine delenit*, “then Pan made music on his rustic pipes, and with his rude notes quite charmed king Midas”. *barbarico* spells ‘Phrygian’, and carries over dangerous overtones of corrupted musical style; *delenit* is not the right kind of bucolic sweetness, and *agrestibus* recalls *rusticitas*, not the ‘new chic’ of Virgilian country music: localism is wedded to cheapness. Then of course Midas is a discredited supporter: the satrap is not a bona fide shepherd, more like a spoiled groupie of Pan (11.146–147 *ille perosus opes silvas et rura colebat / Panaque ...*, “but Midas, hating wealth, haunted the woods and fields, and worshipped Pan”). He has had his chance to meet a higher version of bucolics, and has blown it: he starts his Ovidian episode by gaining control over a tied-up Silenus, precisely the situation that originates the highest level of Virgilian bucolics, *Ecl.* 6:²⁶ but all he can make of the occasion is an accursed gold rush. So the episode presents us with a spurious version of bucolic poetics, one in which the keynote is lowly but not simple and pure, élite audiences are corrupted, and *rusticitas* is divorced from elegance. To find a new occasion, we will have to endure a face-off with Polyphemus in book 13.

3. *Auxesis*

In fact, in the Polyphemus story, this low-key version of pastoral becomes a rising performance: Joseph Farrell has rightly selected *auxesis* as the dominant feature of the episode.²⁷ This is true even at the most basic of levels, that of line numbers: at 81 lines, the lovesong of Polyphemus is exactly (and intentionally, I suspect) as long as the entire Theocritean text that serves as its main model, *Id.* 11. A similar ratio obtains at the level of music: the Cyclopean panpipe has 100 reeds (13.784), not the usual 7 or 9, more like the hundred mouths typically required for high epic. Its sound is described by Galatea as *pastoria sibila*, “rustic pipings” (13.785), and the pathetic fallacy involves *toti montes*, “whole mountains” and the sea-waves, not the usual *locus amoenus*: the sound effect is a repeated *senserunt*, “felt” (13.785–786), which means more

²⁶ On the serious philosophical background to the capture of Silenus in Virgil see Hubbard (1975) 55–62.

²⁷ Cf. Farrell (1992b) 246.

than the usual echo—not exactly a soft spell, more like rattling wild nature. *sibila* are found in the Lucretian description of natural sounds when primitive pipe-music began from imitation of nature (5.1382), but not in Virgilian representations of musical acoustics. In addition, Ovid might have been aware of scholarly debates on the nature of the ῥοῖζος (Hom., *Od.* 9.315), a “whistling sound” (?) used by Homer’s Cyclops to shepherd his flocks. It is not by chance that the expansionist song begins with a comparative, *candidior*, “whiter” (13.789), when the Theocritean Cyclops had begun with ὦ λευκὰ Γαλάτεια, “O white Galateia”, and only in the second line had moved on to a comparative (λευκοτέρω, “whiter”).²⁸

The song is even more impressive for its wholeness, for being full and totalizing, if one remembers that snippets of Cyclops’ song or of songs about the Cyclops or of quotations of those songs had been typical of the fragmentation and decontextualisation that we recognize in the evolution of bucolics as recapitulated by Virgil.²⁹ The rhetorical matrix of this *auxesis* is of course the Cyclops’ own body: he is proud of being huge and shaggy (13.842–850):

aspice, sim quantus: non est hoc corpore maior
Iuppiter in caelo ...
... rigidis horrent densissima saetis
corpora ...
barba viros hirtaeque decent in corpore saetae.

Just look how big I am! Jove himself up there in the sky has no bigger body ... and do not think it ugly that my whole body is covered with thick, bristling hair ... so a beard and shaggy hair on his body well become a man.

This goes beyond the standards of Theocritus and Virgil. We should remember that Latin rhetoric knows not only the ‘grand’ style, but also ‘shaggy’ as a quality of style, more or less ‘old-fashioned, primitive, unrefined’, as in the presentation of Ennius’ *Annales* by Ovid himself (*Trist.* 2.259): *nihil est hirsutius illis*, “nothing is ruder than they” (cf. *Met.* 13.765–766 *rigidos capillos ... hirsutam ... barbam*, “shaggy hair, rough beard”). The peculiar tension of this episode is that the Cyclops has

²⁸ The choice of the comparison in the first line (13.789), *candidior folio nivei ... ligustri*, “whiter than snowy privet-leaves”, shows awareness of the mediation of Virgil: *alba ligustra*, “white privets”, are mentioned by the poet only in 2.18, an eclogue conditioned by the memory of the Theocritean Cyclops.

²⁹ As Papangelis shows in this volume, pp. 382–393.

been trying to control this alarming ‘growth’: according to Galatea he is using the tools of Ovidian elegiac *cultus* towards a complete cleanup (combing, shaving, using a mirror, making faces at the mirror: 13.764–767), until during the speech he lets loose and moves from *cura placendi* to epic horror.

Ovid is not the first to scrutinize the Homeric storyboard and discuss the aesthetics of *auxesis*. An episode of criticism reported by Seneca the Elder (*Suas.* 1.12) might be relevant here:

corruptissimam rem omnium quae umquam dictae sunt ex quo homines disertis insanire coeperunt putabant Dorionis esse in metaphrasi dictam Homeri, cum excaecatus Cyclops saxum in mare reiecit. Haec quo modo ex corruptis eo perveniant ut et magna et tamen sana sint aiebat Maecenas apud Vergilium intellegi posse. Tumidum est: ὄρονς ὄρος ἀποσπᾶται. Vergilius quid ait? “rapit haud partem exiguum montis”. Ita magnitudini studet (ut) non imprudenter discedat a fide.

It was generally agreed that the most decadent thing said since the eloquent began to go mad was a remark of Dorion paraphrasing Homer, where the blinded Cyclops flings a rock into the sea. Maecenas used to say that you could tell from Virgil how this, instead of being decadent, could be made grand and yet sane at the same time. It is bombastic to say: “Mountain is torn from mountain”. So what does Virgil say? His character seizes “no small part of a mountain”. He keeps size in mind without ill-advised departure from truth.

The infamous Dorion, “most corrupted ever” of writers, in his paraphrase of the *Odyssey* in Greek had substituted “a mountain is torn from the mountain” for the Homeric “summit of a great mountain” (*Od.* 9.481). Virgil avoids the trap of bombastic *magnitudo*, “size”, by using litotes: *haud partem exiguum montis*, “no small part of a mountain”. As if aware that this is a sensitive test, Ovid goes one better with the studied simplicity of *partemque e monte revulsam*, “mountain is torn from mountain” (13.883, spoken by Galatea), not even the emphasis of litotes—one has to go back to the song of the Cyclops and then realize that the Cyclops had been using *pars montis* (13.810) about his own immense *antra*, “cavern”. So how big is really a *pars montis*, “part of a mountain”? And how regular a mountain is Aetna? This kind of simplicity is different from the casual, distancing reference of Theocr. 7.152 ὃς ὠρεῖ νᾶας ἔβαλλε, “he who would cast mountains at ships”: it presupposes readers who will scrutinize every move of the new poet within the competitive spirit of Roman literary debates. Amusingly, the hype of *auxesis* invests the bucolic lovesong of Polyphemus more than the epic narrative of Galatea.

A simple dualism of epic and bucolics is, on the other hand, too schematic.³⁰ When Ovid rewrites Polyphemus, bucolic and elegiac codes had been in contact for a long time, and it is difficult to separate them. Polyphemus' song has been described as a bucolic *paraklausithyron*, and in a world of caves and boulders one needs a mighty voice to be heard; but it is more important to realize that the Cyclops is a paradox in elegiac terms. He introduces himself as the *dives amator* and the wooing poet: a contradiction for an elegist. The interplay of elegiac and bucolic is seen in a microcosm at 13.824 *pauperis est numerare pecus*, "it is a poor man's business to count his flocks": true enough, it is a witty correction of the 'thousand sheep' of Theocritus and Virgil (*Id.* 11.35 and *Ecl.* 2.21 respectively), and *numerare pecus*, "to count the flocks" is an obvious activity for a shepherd (cf. Virg. *Ecl.* 3.34 "twice a day"), but there is also a precise allusion to Tibullus 1.5.25 *numerare pecus*, 1.5 being the very poem in which the oppositional language of *dives amator* / *pauper poeta*, "rich lover / poor poet" originates. The Cyclops distances himself from the model of the *pauper poeta*, only to fall into the trap of the *dives amator*: both roles are losing ones, when the rival is a stunning teenager.

The Cyclops had always been, since Theocritus, a model for the prehistory of bucolics: he had been shaped both as a prehistory-cum-difference and as a pioneer of the genre. He is a perennial surprise for readers who focus on the opposition between the wild and the cultivated: he turns out to be more sophisticated than readers of Homer

³⁰ In the context of this paper I cannot discuss further generic complications in the representation of the Cyclops, such as satyr play, or pantomime. On the Cyclops as a pantomime hero note Hor. *Epist.* 2.2.124–125 *ludentis speciem dabit et torquebitur, ut qui / nunc Satyrum, nunc agrestem Cyclopa movetur*, "he will offer the appearance of playfulness, and yet be on the rack, like someone who represents by dancing now a Satyr, and now a rustic Cyclops" ("dances": for details see Brink (1982) 346–348). It has been conjectured that the Satyr is Acis and the entire reference is to a Cyclops and Galatea show, but this is unnecessary. However, it is not entirely impossible that Ovid includes pantomime in his 'dialogue of genres'. Then the final cue in the lament of the Cyclops, *nec tu, Galatea, moveris!*, "and you, Galatea, do not care at all" (13.868), could be read as a witty double-entendre (with Galatea not only unresponsive, but also reluctant to enter her pantomime role, *moveri*, "to represent by dancing", being one technical word for bodywork in pantomimes, cf. Brink (1982) 348 and Brink (1971) 284); likewise, *notis saltibus errat*, "wanders through familiar glens" (13.872) in the raging bull simile, would be even too appropriate to a pantomimic Cyclops, *notis saltibus* being his customary antics on stage as a dancer, with *saltare* as a technical word of pantomime: cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.5.63 *pastorem saltaret uti Cyclopa rogabat*, "he begged him to dance the Cyclops' shepherd-dance".

would expect, and at the same time, too wild and primitive for a 'modern' bucolic singer.

In the Cyclopean tradition of bucolic song (Theocr. *Id.* 11 and 6, as well as presumably Moschus and Bion, not to speculate on predecessors in dithyramb, "new music", and mime), the singer may be primitive but he is not innocent of literature:³¹ Polyphemus uses older models and is also used by them—the Cyclops is both smarter than we think, and naive as suits a primitive singer. For example, while the Theocritean Cyclops appropriates Sappho,³² the Ovidian Cyclops reuses a Callimachean text of Horace (13.791):

splendidior vitro, tenero lascivior haedo.

more sparkling than crystal, more frolicsome than a tender kid.

splendidior vitro, from Hor. *C.* 3.13.1, is even more pointed as a compliment if one remembers its Callimachean quality (*Hec.* 18.2 Hollis "the sky was more shiny than crystal") of *leptotes* (programmatic?) in the Horatian poem about the *locus amoenus* of the *fons Bandusiae*. However, as befits Cyclopean poetics, the allusion is also awkward, because of the proximity of *tenero lascivior haedo*, "more frolicsome than a tender kid": the pure water of the Horatian spring (3.13.3–7 *cras donaberis haedo ... gelidos inficiet tibi / rubro sanguine rivos / lascivi suboles gregis*, "tomorrow shall you be honored with a kid ... this offspring of the frolicsome flock shall dye your cool waters with its own red blood") will be stained by the blood of a kid from a "frolicsome flock" (lamb and calf had been the animals mentioned in the model of Theocr. *Id.* 11, 12 and 20), and the contrast suggests that for Polyphemus it is possible to be both tender and bloodthirsty.

Now the musical Cyclops even appropriates, and obviously mishandles, the most sophisticated device of the bucolic genre: amoebean performance.³³ He must be adapting the device from his own experience as a character in Theocr. *Id.* 6 and as a persona in various eclogues (2, 7, and 8: often in amoebean exchanges, of course); but the effect has been lost on many a commentator. The infamous sequence of 19 lines of comparatives and comparative ablatives³⁴ has elicited negative com-

³¹ Goldhill (1991) 258–259 has fundamental insights on the instability of oppositions between naivety and sophistication.

³² Hunter (1999) 229–230.

³³ On amoebean practice as a typical occasion for quotation, framing, and the appropriation of tradition see Breed in this volume.

³⁴ In the *Eclogues*, according to Clausen (1994) 226, the structure with comparative

ments: but if we adopt a truly bucolic reading, the long initial sequence is not just bad and shapeless in a random way. The real problem is that the sequence turns out to have an over-nice symmetrical (and thus parodic) structure of competitive exchange. The Cyclops sings nine lines of praise and ten lines of *querelae* about Galatea; the first block includes 13 comparatives (in praise of her beauty) and the second block responds with 13 comparatives (lamenting her unresponsive nature). Grand scale indeed, but still impressive competence: it is typical of agonistic performances in the pastoral tradition to exploit a repartee structure. But now the same performer is playing both roles. Voracious, ravenous as he is, the swelling Cyclops has ingested the entire tradition of bucolic performance.

It is important to realize that *auxesis* in the episode operates from the inside out: it is activated from the lungs of Polyphemus, not from the narrative voices of Galatea and the epic narrator. The landscape, and the intertexts of Virgil's *Eclogues* or of Theocr. 11, offer an analogy for this situation: the Cyclops is not only a shepherd whose lambs "roam over the Sicilian mountains" (cf. Virg. *Ecl.* 2.21, about Corydon ~ Polyphemus), or, indeed, a shepherd to whom Aetna carries its cool water (cf. Theocr. 11.47–48 ἔστι ψυχρὸν ὕδωρ, τό μοι ἅ πολυδένδρεος Αἴτνα / λευκᾶς ἐκ χιόνος ποτὸν ἀμβρόσιον προΐητι, "there is chill water, that for me deep-wooded Aetna sends down from the white snow, a draught divine!"). He actually says that he has Aetna inside him: *cumque suis video translata viribus Aetnam / pectore ferre meo*, "I see that I am carrying Aetna, transported, with all its violence, into my own chest", *Met.* 13.868–869 (*translatam* draws attention to the bold and lofty metaphor he uses *vs* the standard amatory language of "I am on fire"). In this poem at least, mention of the volcano is inseparable from the mythological theme that typically suggests 'high epic style', Gigantomachy: Aetna is the mountain piled on top of the impious giant Typhoeus (as pointed out at 5.346–358 and 14.1), so it has an impious fire-spitting monster inside: the paradigm is activated when Polyphemus crushes Acis under "a piece of the mountain" (13.882–883), but also when he despises not only Jove but even his thunderbolt: *Iovem et caelum et sperno et penetrabile fulmen*, "I scorn Jove and his heaven and his all-piercing thunderbolt" (13.857). In other words there is no

and ablative is only found (with one exception) in *Ecl.* 7, a poem marked by the theme of the wooing Cyclops, and only in imitations from Theocritus (it is of course a structure typical of praise in love poetry, cf. Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *C.* 1.19.6).

way to cope with Polyphemus' love for Galatea, since it threatens to outgrow not only bucolics, but even the *Odyssey* and the *Aeneid*, in the direction of the always excessive Gigantomachies: *Nerei, te vereor, tua fulmine saevior ira est*, "I fear you alone, o Nereid: your anger is more deadly than the thunderbolt" (13.858).³⁵

Finally, the new ambitions of this Cyclops are also revealed by his impact on the landscape of the Sicilian coast. Ovidian singers are also landscape artists: they rearrange through their performance the appropriate landscape, instead of simply representing it. When Orpheus as *vates* needs *umbra*, "shadow" (10.88–90), he attracts a *nemus*, "wood" (10.143).³⁶ The Cyclops sings on a natural promontory shaped like an arrowhead³⁷ (13.778–779 *prominet in pontum cuneatus acumine longo / collis*, "a wedge-shaped promontory with long, sharp point juts into the sea"), and in the end he will smash Acis with a corner of a boulder (13.882–884). The final result is a *moles*, "mass" (13.887 and 890) on the seaside, and the *moles* is suddenly pierced by an image of Acis as a river-god. The violent efforts of Polyphemus turn out to have created some kind of pleasure resort on the seaside, a maritime villa. *Moles* is a keyword of ambitious luxury in this kind of architecture (cf. Hor. *C.* 2.15.2, 3.1.34), and a fountain of fresh water would be a welcome addition, especially if decorated with an appropriate water deity. This is interesting because all the characters in the context, not only Acis, but also Polyphemus, Galatea, and Scylla, could claim a role in the mythological decoration of a wealthy beach resort, complete with grottoes, fountains, pools, gondolas, and statues. Polyphemus is, in fact, the most common decorative subject for mythological decoration found in Roman villas, particularly the ones bordering on water (one could variously compare Sperlonga, Castelgandolfo, Tivoli, Baiae, even the Domus Aurea³⁸). The story of Acis and Polyphemus thus ends up producing the kind of 'natural' set-

³⁵ Cf. the splendid reading of Connors (2005) 252–253. I draw attention to it, since her paper is officially on the 17th cent. Latin novel *Argenis* by John Barclay, and so likely to escape Ovidian scholars. Barclay, who is an astute reader of Ovid, *inter alia* imagines (Connors, cit.) a mythological villa fountain in Sicily commemorating the death of Acis: he is thus close to my own approach to Ovid; see below.

³⁶ More than 20 qualities are represented, as befits a villa park: among them, casually thrown in, symbolic plants of Virgilian pastoral, *fagus*, "beech" (10.92) and *tenues myricae*, "slender tamarisk" (10.97).

³⁷ Possibly an anticipation of the fate of *Acis*, whose name could have suggested 'tip' in Greek.

³⁸ Balensiefen (2005) independently suggests a link between those decorations and Ovid's narratives about Acis and Scylla.

ting in which the mythical tradition would be best appreciated: the artificial complex of a typical Roman villa, which is in turn the appropriate theatre for the consumption of bucolic poetry. If Orpheus is a typical master of the *ars topiaria*, assembling a carefully chosen selection of trees and shrubs (cf. 10.90–106), Polyphemus specializes in rocky seascapes. In fact, as we shall see in a final section, he anticipates the character of the ideal reader and consumer of bucolic poetry: the Roman villa owner, the one who assembles a park in order to listen to Orpheus or Tityrus.

4. *Roman Perspectives on Bucolic Poetics: Ownership and Quietism*

Two general points instead of a precise conclusion. If there is a pattern in the three episodes, it must be about surprising revisions of bucolic topoi: the two revisited Cyclopean topoi that deserve special attention from historians of the bucolic genre concern the economy and the ideology of the pastoral world.

The first is about the material world inhabited by the giant. We are prepared to the idea that the Cyclops will sing the praises of his life to Galatea. But the Ovidian Polyphemus turns commodities and benefits of pastoral life into a landowner's checklist. The Theocritean model of 11.45–47 ἐντὶ ... ἐντὶ ... / ἔσται ... ἔσται ... / ἔσται, “are ... are ... is ... is ... is”, is constructed as ‘naive’ *vs* the language of ownership of 13.821–830, *meum est ... sunt ... sunt quoque ... mihi ... adest*, “is mine ... there are ... there are also ... there is for me”: the Theocritean Cyclops stresses availability and nature's bountiful *loca amoena*, the Ovidian Cyclops is a well-organized *vilicus*. We should remember³⁹ that the Midas story had already suggested a certain critique of bucolic ‘natural’ life: its most committed supporter was in fact an Asian billionaire who had nearly been choked to death by his own wealth. Now with the Cyclops we have the beginning of an economic *auxesis* of pastoral life: what he has is not just animals, but a cheese factory, and trees are his ‘slaves’ (13.820 *omnis tibi serviet arbor*, “every tree shall yield to your desire”).

This feature of course can be explained, or explained away, as parody, since it is regularly important for a parodic or satiric mode to mix

³⁹ Above, pp. 415–416.

conventional topoi and realistic references, with the intention of laying bare the artificial and interested nature of conventions. Yet it is more important to remember that references to ownership, land, and agricultural activity were a specific aspect of what may be termed the Romanisation of pastoral poetry.⁴⁰ Were they perceived by Roman readers as the sign of a transformation inflicted on the ‘unbearable lightness’ of Theocritean pastoral?

Some of the surprising references to agriculture on *Met.* 13.789–837—in a land where, according to the Homeric perspective of *Met.* 14.2–3, nobody knew about *rastra*, “harrows”,⁴¹ and oxen—bring us, in poetic terms, into georgic territory: the Cyclops may be a mad shepherd, but he knows about grapes, well-watered orchards, *indomitae iuvencae*, “untamed heifers”, willows, vine,⁴² weeds, plums and other fruit. If Ovid does mean to cross the divide between pastoral and georgic world, the operation would make sense in terms of a recapitulation of Virgil’s oeuvre.⁴³ The Cyclops and Galatea story is based on the intertext of Virgil’s *Eclogues*, but it is an interlude in the chronicle of Aeneas’ journey, and in a while the epic poem will move on to a recreation of the Cyclops adventure in the *Aeneid-cum-Odyssey* (14.158–220). The same geography, the same character and the same poem are now bridging the *Eclogues* and the *Aeneid*, and by the end of the bucolic section of this Life of Polyphemus we do perceive serious indications of ‘rising’⁴⁴ and of the most epic of passions, anger:⁴⁵ it is perhaps no coincidence that Polyphemus shows the intention to trespass into the *Georgics*, the obvious middle ground between pastoral and heroic poetry, before he rattles the narrative space of the Ovidian *AeneOdyssey*. (To judge by the amount of facial and body hair mentioned at 13.765–766 and 846–850,

⁴⁰ The presence of ownership and farming in the pastoral life of Virgil is still a powerful topic in criticism of the *Eclogues*: note, e.g., in different directions, Connolly (2001) and Osgood (2006).

⁴¹ At 13.765, ironically, Polyphemus was using *rastra* to comb his hair.

⁴² Although here with Homeric precedent, a passage that was (and is) likely to stimulate controversy among interpreters: according to *Od.* 9.111 the Cyclopes have something called οἶνος ἐριστάφυλος, “wine made of fine grapes”.

⁴³ Similarly analysed by Most (1987) 208–209 in the *Culex*.

⁴⁴ Note the importance of 14.871 *surgit*, “springs up” (well noticed by Farrell (1992b) 258, who points out the use of *surgere* as a closural indication at the end of the *Eclogues* book), followed by the georgic simile of the sexually frustrated bull.

⁴⁵ 13.876–877, after the end of what is described as a lament (870 *talía nequiquam questus* ..., “such vain complaints he uttered”): *tantaque vox, quantam Cyclops iratus habere / debuit, illa fuit: clamore perhorruit Aetne*, “his voice was big and terrible as a furious Cyclops’ voice should be: Aetna trembled with the din of it”.

he is now significantly older than the young Cyclops of Theocr. *Id.* 11 and 6,⁴⁶ approaching the epic maturity of the cannibal. After the Acis episode, he will cross over to heroic epic, and his trajectory will be a de-evolution into the harshest primitivism: ancient theory often puts cannibalism before the first steps of *Kulturgeschichte*, herding, then tilling the ground⁴⁷).

The other surprise is that the pursuit of *otium* and *hasychia*, quiet pleasures amid lulling natural sounds imitated in music and song, as famously portrayed in Theocritus and Virgil and programmatically evoked at the beginning of their respective collections, and famously intensified in Virgil with the help of Epicurean resonances, turns out to be problematic in Ovid: a dangerous trap for pastoral characters. Argus' relaxation becomes deadly as soon as his hundredth eye yields to sleep, and the invitation to relax becomes an invitation to a beheading; Midas courts the natural life, but ends up as an asinine version of Pan; Acis and Galatea strike the perfect pose of bucolic *otiosus*: they lie down in a sheltered cave as they listen to the music, but in the end the deep voice of the Cyclops heralds a spoiled afterglow for Acis.⁴⁸

⁴⁶ Hunter (1999) 244 on the relative chronology of Polyphemus in Theocr. *Id.* 11 and 6.

⁴⁷ Brink (1971) on Hor. *A.P.* 392.

⁴⁸ English translations of the Latin passages are from the relevant Loeb editions, with occasional modifications.

A DREAM SHATTERED? PASTORAL ANXIETIES IN SENECA DRAMA

ALESSANDRO SCHIESARO

1. *Chthonic mastertexts*

No 1st century author appears as impervious to the attractions of pastoral—a landscape, a form of life, a poetic genre—as Seneca in his tragedies. The almost complete absence of idyllic settings, the conventional background to pastoral in its various permutations (even highly idiosyncratic ones, such as Calpurnius¹), is all the more evident because of the parallel abundance in the plays of staggering *loca horrida*, a key feature of Seneca’s original take on tragedy. Greek models did not offer anything approaching the depth and breadth of topographic luxury we find in his plays, since *loca* both *amoena* and *horrida* are reduced to functional backdrops evoked in a few lines.² Most plays eschew *topothesia* altogether, and even in the few cases—*Prometheus Bound*, *Bacchae*, *Philoctetes*, *Oedipus at Colonus*—where a specific locale is essential to the plot, descriptive elements are hardly elaborated upon. In Seneca’s *Oedipus*, *Thyestes* and *Hercules furens*, as well as in the *Oetaeus* and *Phaedra*,³ extreme landscapes described in a wealth of details occupy a central position, and, needless to say, they deserve to be seen as crucial nexus for the articulation of the plays’ ideological and literary agenda rather than tokens of allegiance to the conventions of rhetoric⁴ or compensatory elements for the lack of proper staging.

¹ See Mayer in this volume, esp. pp. 459–461, on the disappearance of Arcadia in Calpurnius’ *Ecloques*.

² See Elliger (1975) 211–274.

³ A complete list of classified *loca* in Aygon (2004) 472–475.

⁴ The contrast Curtius (1948) 194 suggests between the “poetically felt” and “harmonized” ideal landscape in Virgil and that of Ovid and his successors, where ‘descriptions of nature become brief interludes’, still exerts influence on contemporary criticism.

The most extended *locus horridus* is Theseus' eyewitness account of the Underworld in *Hercules furens* (662–725).⁵ Access to the realm of the dead is on a mountain which provides the emotion of 'vertical' sublime (note *attollit*, "rises", at l. 662), intensified in this case by the clash between the land and sea (663 *ubi aequor Taenarus ... premit*, "where Cape Taenarus hems the sea"). Colours are not mentioned, but darkness is conveyed both by the height of the impending mountain and the thickness of the vegetation (663 *densis ... silvis*, "with its dense forests"). Here *ora solvit Ditis invisī domus / hiatque rupes alta et immenso specu / ingens vorago faucibus vastis patet / latumque pandit omnibus populis iter*, "the house of hateful Dis opens its mouth; a tall cliff gapes wide, a cavernous abyss extends its vast jaws and spreads a broad path for all nations" (664–667).⁶ The vertiginous effect of the *rupes alta* and the *specus* is enhanced by the vastness of the *vorago*, an essential component of the *horror*-effect which is also developed a few lines later: *hinc ampla vacuis spatia laxantur locis, / in quae omne mersum pergat humanum genus*, "then there open up empty regions, spaces extensive enough for the human race to enter, once plunged into the earth" (673–674). Seneca, as he states explicitly in his *Letters to Lucilius*,⁷ is aware that vast expanses of space with uncertain contours can be horrifying.⁸ The quality of light in this liminal area contributes to the overall disconcerting effect, since complete darkness does not immediately prevail: *non caeca tenebris incipit primo via; / tenuis relictæ lucis a tergo nitor / fulgorque dubius solis afflicti cadit / et ludit aciem: nocte sic mixta solet / praebere lumen primus aut serus dies*, "at the outset the way is not obscured by darkness: there falls a faint brightness from the light left behind, a twilight glow of the weakened sunshine, which baffles the eye. Such is the light, mingled with darkness, familiar at dawn or dusk" (668–672).⁹

⁵ On this passage see Fitch (1987) 292–293, and now the excellent treatment by Aygon (2004) 372.

⁶ For Seneca's tragedies I print Fitch's excellent translation, with occasional divergences. Unless otherwise noted, all other translations are from the relevant Loeb editions.

⁷ See below, p. 446, on *Letter* 41.

⁸ As theorized centuries later by Saint-Évremond's *Dissertation sur le mot de vaste*, a 17th cent. ancestor of Freud's theory of the uncanny (Orlando (1995) 381).

⁹ The detail features in Virgil's Underworld, *Aen.* 6.270–272; for its association with numinousness cf. e.g. *Ov. am.* 1.5.1–8 with McKeown *ad loc.* It will be picked up in the modern archetype of the *locus horridus*, Tasso's selva: "Qui ne l'ora che'l sol più chiaro splende / è luce incerta e scolorita e mesta, / quale in núbilo ciel dubbia si vede/ se'l di a la notte o s'ella a lui succede" (*Gerusalemme liberata* xiii.2.13–16).

The underworld proper is described through a combination of positive and negative statements, the latter prompted by Amphytrion's hapless question at 697. We encounter the *palus inertis foeda Cocyti*, "the foul swamp of the torpid Cocytus" (686), with its expected sluggishness,¹⁰ crowded by ominous birds; trees provide gloomy darkness: *horrent opaca fronde nigrantes comae / taxo imminente*, "black bedraggled foliage hangs in shadowy fronds on an overhanging yew tree" (689–690). No traces of the *locus amoenus* survive (698–706):

*non prata viridi laeta facie germinant,
nec adulta leni fluctuat Zephyro seges;
non ulla ramos silva pomiferos habet;
sterilis profundi vastitas squalet soli
et foeda tellus torpet aeterno situ
[rerumque maestus finis et mundi ultima.]
immotus aer haeret et pigro sedet
nox atra mundo: cuncta maerore horrida
ipsaque morte peior est mortis locus.*

There are no joyful grassy meadows of verdant aspect, no ripened grain rippling in the gentle west wind; no trees with fruit-laden branches; a barren desolation crusts over the Stygian soil, and the foul earth languishes in perpetual stagnation [—sad end of things, the world's last estate]. The air hangs motionless, and black night sits over the torpid world. Everything is rough and gloomy, and the place of death is worse than death itself.

Within this general context of darkness, torpor and decay, an even starker scenery, an inset *locus horridus*, surrounds the royal abode of Ditis (709–710; 716–720):

*est in recessu Tartari obscuro locus,
quem gravibus umbris spissa caligo alligat.*

...

*cingitur duplici vado
adversa Ditis regia, atque ingens domus
umbrante luco tegitur. hic vasto specu
pendent tyranni limina, hoc umbris iter,
haec porta regni.*

In a dark recess of Tartarus there is a place bound by thick fog and deep shadows ... the palace of Dis is ringed in front by this pair of rivers, and the huge house is masked by a shadowing grove. Here is the cavernous arched doorway of the tyrant; this is the path for the shades, the gate of the kingdom.

¹⁰ See Schiesaro (1985) and Borca (2000) on this specific feature of water in a chthonic setting.

Seneca's complex description of the Underworld—and the preceding section on the Sibyl's cave—is closely connected with the Virgilian mastertext of 'horrific' sublime in Book 6 of the *Aeneid*,¹¹ which already contains all the defining features of the *locus*, albeit in a significantly different form. Virgil does remark upon the eery quality of light (270–272), the ample, ominous elm-tree (283–285), the muddy waters and awesome vortex of the Acheron (296–297), but reserves the better part of his description to the population of the Underworld, a catalogue stretching from personified concepts such as *Luctus* and *Curae* (274) to the horrific menagerie of Dis (286–289: Centaurs, Scyllae, Gorgons ...). Seneca will offer a similar catalogue in his *Oedipus*,¹² although chiefly in pursuit of a rather different agenda.

Nor should it be forgotten that in *Aeneid* 6 the description of the Underworld is balanced later in the book by that of the *locos laetos et amoena virecta*, "a land of joy and pleasant lawns" (6.638) of the blessed (6.637–706), evoked, again, sparsely but convincingly (see esp. 642–643, 656–659, 674, 679) with an emphasis on light, movement, colours, music. Orpheus (645) and Musaeus (667) attend here to their traditional occupations, in stark contrast with the chthonic poetry which arises from Seneca's underworld in the *Oedipus*.¹³ No morally loaded balancing act between *loca amoena* and *horrida* is to be found in Seneca, in the *Furens* or elsewhere. The pleasures of *locus amoenus* have no place in his mental landscape, except as as distant, impossible foil.¹⁴

2. *Dangerous shades*

While the *Furens* provides a rich *amplificatio* of Virgil's archetypal Underworld, and thus firmly establishes the genealogical connection between the realm of the dead and the recurring features of the *locus horridus*, *Oedipus* offers a more dynamic expansion of the model.

Creon has been tasked by the king with discovering the causes of the plague, and he wanders to a dark grove outside the city (530–536, 542–547).¹⁵

¹¹ See esp. ll. 268–297. Schiller already noticed that in this section "the intensification of horror strives for sublimity": cf. Heinze (1993) 379.

¹² Lines 590–594. See below, p. 433.

¹³ See below, pp. 443–444.

¹⁴ A list in Aygon (2004) 473, cf. Larson (1994) 86–87.

¹⁵ Cf. Aygon (2004) 214–218.

*est procul ab urbe lucus ilicibus niger
Dircaea circa vallis inriguae loca.
cupressus altis exerens silvis caput
virente semper alligat trunco nemus,
curvosque tendit quercus et putres situ
annosa ramos: huius abrupti latus
edax vetustas ...*

...
*medio stat ingens arbor atque umbra gravi
silvas minores urguet et magno ambitu
diffusa ramos una defendit nemus.
tristis sub illa, lucis et Phoebi inscius,
restagnat umor frigore aeterno rigens;
limosa pigrum circumit fontem palus.*

There lies at a distance from the city a grove dark with holm oaks, on the sides of the well-watered Vale of Dirce. Cypresses thrust their heads above the high trees and encircle the wood with their evergreen trunks; ancient oaks stretch out bent branches, rotten and crumbling: one of these has its side torn away by devouring time ... in the midst stands a massive tree that crowds lesser trees with its heavy shade, and with its great circle of spreading branches serves by itself as protector of the woodland. In gloom beneath it, untouched by Phoebus' light, lies a pool chilled by perpetual cold; a muddy swamp surrounds the sluggish spring.

Here Seneca follows the traditional mode of the *topothesia per parebasin*,¹⁶ signalled by the canonical *est ... lucus* at l. 530, as he offers the picture of a place which subverts all the expected pleasures of a *locus amoenus*. Tall trees surround and overshadow the grove, so that no natural light can seep through (545); the pond is stagnant and freezing (546);¹⁷ the *fons* itself is remiss, and surrounded by marshes. Decay is everywhere (534).

Doubtless this description is meant to recall, antiphrastically, that of *locus amoenus*. One detail suffices to steer readers in the right direction. The most important feature of an idyllic-pastoral landscape is the presence of a pleasant shade, the *umbra* with which friendly trees shelter the shepherd from excessive heat and allow him to relax and sing.¹⁸ Here, it is the *umbra* itself which is excessive, and therefore dangerous.¹⁹ *Umbra gravi* at l. 542 harks back to Lucretius 6.783–785 *arboribus primum certis **gravis umbra** tributa / usque adeo, capitis faciant ut saepe dolores,*

¹⁶ The classic study is Barchiesi (1967) chap. 5.

¹⁷ Cf. Sens in this volume, pp. 149–152.

¹⁸ On Virgil's 'invention' of pastoral *umbra* see Clausen (1994) xxv–xxvi.

¹⁹ See Nováková (1964) 26–28 on “harmful *umbra*”, and Hardie in this volume, pp. 277–280, 288.

siquis eas subter iacuit prostratus in herbis, “firstly, certain trees have a shade so dangerous that they often cause headache, if one has lain beneath stretched out on the herbage”. This incidental notation occurs in the context of a discussion about the multiplicity of elements, both positive and negative, which can be found on earth: *scilicet haec ideo terris ex omnia surgunt, / multa modis multis multarum semina rerum / quod permixta gerit tellus discretaque tradit*, “you may be sure that the reason why all these things rise from the soil is that the earth has many seeds of many things which she holds mixed up in many ways and separates apart before passing them on” (6.788–790). The concept fits neatly within Lucretius’ antiprovidentialist outlook (cf., e.g., 6.760–761): some trees are good, some can be dangerous; the same element can produce positive or negative effects on human beings, since no element of the natural world was created for us (or, for that matter, against us). But Lucretius’ image of a man *prostratus in herbis* under the shade of a tree recalls in turn his own reconstruction, earlier in the poem, of a *locus amoenus*: ... *cum tamen inter se prostrati in gramine molli / propter aquae rivum sub ramis arboris altae / non magnis opibus iucunde corpora curant, / praesertim cum tempestas arridet et anni / tempora conspergunt viridantis floribus herbas*, “... when all the same stretched forth in groups upon the soft grass beside a rill of water under the branches of a tall tree men merrily refresh themselves at no great cost, especially when the weather smiles and the season of the year besprinkles the green herbage with flowers” (2.29–33). This mutability of *umbra*, pleasant relief in Book 2, deadly danger in Book 6, is in Lucretius’ eyes another instance of the unpredictable variations to which human life is subjected in the natural world. But the metamorphosis which *umbra* undergoes between the beginning and the end of the *De rerum natura* finds an even more pregnant parallel in Virgil’s *Eclogues*, which open with Tityrus *recubans sub tegmine fagi*, “lying under the canopy of a spreading beech” (1.1) and *lentus in umbra*, “at ease beneath the shade” (1.4), but close with a different kind of shade: *surgamus: solet esse gravis cantantibus umbra, / iuniperi gravis umbra; nocent et frugibus umbrae*, “let us arise: the shade is often perilous to the singer—perilous the juniper’s shade, hurtful the shade even to the crops” (10.75–76). The transition from the refreshing shade created by the *fagus* and the twilight of impending darkness (another liminal form of light) frame the space and time of pastoral. Seneca picks up where Virgil (in Lucretius’ footsteps) had left off: his *gravis umbra* has no positive counterpart, no compensatory alternative. The space and time for pastoral are over.

Creon's exploration of the underworld following his entrance into the grove and the incantations he is able to master (572 *rata verba fudi*, "the spells I uttered were valid"), reveal, unsurprisingly, a thoroughly tragic landscape, where no trace of pastoral idyll can find refuge, but characters such as Niobe, Agave, Pentheus and the Bacchae hold sway.²⁰

The horrific landscape of the grove is literally liminal: it is still on earth (just), yet it partakes of the defining features of the underworld;²¹ indeed, it is ready to undergo a metamorphosis which elides the distinction between the upper- and the underworld, as it becomes itself a part of the latter (574–581). Finally, the punishing *umbra* of the trees paves the way for Creon's encounter with another type of *umbrae*, the ghosts of the dead (563). But the grove is liminal in another direction as well. Some of its features had already cropped up in the description of Thebes at the beginning of the play. Oedipus himself is aware that the city has undergone a dramatic transformation, and is now the very antithesis of a *locus amoenus*, as an *inferna facies*, "hellish vista" (49) dominates even the dwellings of the gods (37–43, 49–51):

*non aura gelido lenis afflatu foveat
anhela flammis corda, non Zephyri leves
spirant, sed ignes auget aestiferi canis
Titan, leonis terga Nemeaei premens.
deseruit amnes umor atque herbas color
aretque Dirce, tenuis Ismenos fluit
et tinguat inopi nuda vix unda vada.*

...

*... denegat fructum Ceres
adulta, et altis flava cum spicis tremat,
arente culmo sterilis emoritur seges.*

No gentle breeze with its cooling breath soothes our hearts that pant with heat, no light westerlies breathe, but the Titan, hard by the back of the Nemean lion, augments the fires of the scorching dog star. Rivers are devoid of moisture, grasses of colour; the Dirce is dry; Ismenos' meagre flow scarcely wets the bare channel with its scanty water ... the mature grain refuses its harvest: though the golden field trembles with tall ears, the crop is barren, and dies on its parched stalks.

²⁰ For a fuller treatment see Schiesaro (2003) 8–10.

²¹ A comparable description in *Tro.* 178–180, the setting for Achilles' return from the Underworld.

He, Oedipus, is the cause of the disaster: *fecimus caelum nocens*, “we have made the heavens baneful” (36). On the other side of the central evocation of the dead, the description of the Underworld proper exacerbates the features of the grove, as *umbra* gives way to *nox vera*, and shades emerge from their chthonic abodes (582–585):

*dehiscit terra et immenso sinu
laxata patuit—ipse pallentes deos
vidi inter umbras, ipse torpentes lacus
noctemque veram, eqs.*

Suddenly the earth gaped and split apart into a vast cavity—with my own eyes I saw the pallid gods among the shades, I saw the stagnant lakes and authentic night, etc.

The multifaceted presence of the *locus horridus* in *Oedipus* brings to light the causal connections which Seneca establishes between its archetypal application to the Underworld and its extension to the world of the living. Not only do there exist on earth liminal spaces which are as *horrida* as the Underworld because they are in direct contact with it, and thus the natural venue for the evocations and other magic rites which are obsessively explored by Seneca and other 1st-cent. authors; also, the upper world itself can metamorphose into an infernal landscape of barren destruction if ethical boundaries are irretrievably transgressed.²² Virgil’s *Aeneid* contains an interesting gesture in this direction. The Trojans’ landing in Carthage takes place in a well-appointed *locus horridus*—not only are there *vastae rupes* and *scopuli*, but *tum silvis scaena coruscis / desuper, horrentique atrum nemus imminet umbra. / fronte sub adversa scopulis pendentibus antrum*, “above, too, is a background of shimmering woods with an overhanging grove, black with gloomy shade. Under the brow of the fronting cliff is a cave of hanging rocks” (1.164–166)—which forcefully conveys the potential violence of the unknown people inhabiting this land, *scaena* hinting at the dramatic setting where Dido’s and Aeneas’ ‘tragedy’ will unfold.²³

Oedipus thus offers the most extensive articulation of the relationship between landscape and dramatic action, and a compelling restatement of the possibilities disclosed by a systematic indulgence in this peculiar form of pathetic fallacy (Sophocles’ *Oedipus at Colonus* provided a

²² As, for instance, in Ovid’s relentlessly chthonic description of Tomis: Williams (2002) 236.

²³ Another potential *locus horridus* is tangentially evoked at 7.22, when Aeneas and his men avoid Circe’s *litora dira*, “accursed shore”. On *Aeneid* 8 see below, p. 447.

powerful inspiration in this direction). In this play, the correspondence between the protagonist's mood and action and the reaction of the natural landscape is suggestive, but also causally connected. The utter desolation which surrounds Oedipus is in fact his fault; should he leave Thebes, nature will thrive again (648–653):

... *funesto gradu*
solum relinquat: vere florifero virens
reparabit herbas; spiritus puros dabit
vitalis aura, veniet et silvis decor;
Letum Luesque, Mors Labor Tabes Dolor,
Comitatus illo dignus, excedent simul.

... let him leave this earth with his fatal steps: it will bloom in a spring-time flowering and regain its verdure; the life-giving air will be pure to breathe, and beauty will appear in the woodlands. Carnage and Plague, Death, Distress, Decay and Pain will depart with him, a worthy retinue.

Fecimus caelum nocens spells out a foundational paradigm of the Senecan landscape, the interdependence between human actions and the response of natural elements, which cannot surprise in an ideological setting permeated by Stoicism. Ovid, however, is again an important influence. Less directly than in the case of Oedipus, Ovid's Lycaon offers a suggestive model for the impact which human behaviour can have upon the landscape. His actions are so egregious that Jupiter must reluctantly come to the conclusion that "the body is incurable" (1.190 *inmedicabile corpus*)—*corpus* neatly grouping here both Lycaon and the natural world his actions condemn to almost complete destruction when the father of gods resolves that only a second creation will dispose of the imminent danger. Seneca appears to give a literal twist to a belief which was metaphorically voiced in Lucretius, but boasts a much more ancient lineage. When Lucretius states that all the punishments of Acheron are here for us on earth (3.978–979 *atque ea nimirum quaecumque Acherunte profundo / prodita sunt esse, in vita sunt omnia nobis*, "and assuredly whatsoever things are fabled to exist in deep Acheron, these all exist for us in this life"), he echoes Empedocles' and Plato's belief that hell is a moral condition experienced in life, a metaphor for guilt and despair.²⁴ Seneca's *Oedipus* embodies this belief in the barren landscape of Thebes, a hell-on-earth brought upon himself by Oedipus' own actions. *Loca horrida* thus become the most appropriate physical correlate for the moral disease affecting Seneca's tragic world. Not only

²⁴ Cf. Dodds (1953) 153, 209, 224 n. 5.

is there no place for any idyllic illusion: hell itself, like the Fury of *Thyestes*, creeps up from its chthonic location, shapes in its own image the threatening liminal spaces where it emerges, and contaminates the world of the living which the gods above have been forced to vacate.

The inversion of Golden Age and idyllic features which we witness in *Oedipus* should also be read in connection with the gendered connotations of the landscape which are central to the Roman imagination.²⁵ Many features of *loca amoena* suggest—both metaphorically and at a symbolic level—the sexual attractiveness of female fertility of which incest deprives the land of Thebes, turning it into a *locus horridus*. Similar connotations can be mapped onto other aspects of the *locus horridus* which recur frequently in Senecan tragedy (note *inter alia* the insistence on old age and decay), and reinforce the crucial nexus established there between regression, incest, and a form of inspiration and knowledge rooted in the realm of the instinctive.²⁶

3. *Debating genealogies*

“Description by negation”²⁷ is a recurrent feature of Senecan *loca horrida*.²⁸ *Hercules furens*, as we have seen, offers a typical instance of the pattern (698–703²⁹). Negative descriptions inevitably highlight an impossible counterfactual, thus voicing a repressed desire: it would be much better, of course, if the land *were* covered by rich crops, but as things stand it cannot be. As always, a string of negatives only puts into sharper relief emotions which cannot find an immediate realisation in the text. In the case at hand, however, there is a second line of enquiry which promises rewards, and brings us to an important Ovidian archetype. In Book 10 of the *Metamorphoses* Orpheus literally ‘invents’ the idyllic landscape of the *locus amoenus*.³⁰ Ovid, too, resorts to a string of negatives. The piece of land upon which Orpheus works his magic is a simple *planissima campi / area*, “a wide-extending plain”, covered by nothing more remarkable than *graminis herbae*, “the grass of

²⁵ Keith (2002) 36–64, esp. 43 and notes 23–24. On modern examples, especially in reference to caves, see Schama (1995) 372–374.

²⁶ Schiesaro (2003) 88–90.

²⁷ Useful surveys of this technique in Davies (1987) and (1988b).

²⁸ Cf. *Oed.* 37–39 (above, pp. 433–434), *Thy.* 652–653, *Herc.O.* 487–488.

²⁹ See above, p. 429.

³⁰ Curtius (1953) 190–200, at 195; Hinds (2002) 127–128.

pasture" (*Met.* 10.86–87).³¹ As such, it could hardly qualify as a *locus amoenus*, lacking even that indispensable element—the shade procured by a tree—which, after Theocritus, the first lines of Virgil's first *Eclogue* promoted to the one unmissable element in any credible pastoral landscape. The transition from the disappointing *umbra loco deerat*, "the place was devoid of shade" (88) to *umbra loco venit*, "shade came to the place" (90) is effected by the divine singer, and signals the arrival of other defining characteristics of the now fully idyllic landscape (90–92):

*non Chaonis abfuit arbor,
non nemus Heliadum, non frondibus aesculus altis,
nec tiliae molles, nec fagus et innuba laurus ...*

there came the Chaonian oak, the grove of the Heliades, the oak with its deep foliage, the soft linden, the beech, the virgin laurel-tree ...

Note that *non ... abfuit*, here, is a variation on the preceding *venit*: these are features which had not been present before Orpheus' arrival, but which accrue to this rather plane *area* thanks to his intervention. With his usual degree of self-awareness, Ovid offers here both a description of the prototypical *locus amoenus*, and an indication of how it was created—for such a place simply did not exist in nature before the demiurgic poet literally assembled together all the necessary elements. It is tempting to contrast this take on the origin of *loca amoena* with Virgil's idealized praise of the farmers' life (*G.* 2.467–471):

*at secure quies et nescia fallere vita,
dives opum variarum, at latis otia fundis,
speluncae vivique lacus et frigida Tempe
mugitusque boum mollesque sub arbores omni
non absunt.*

yet they have sleep free from anxiety, a life that is innocent of guile and rich with untold treasures. The peace of broad domains, caverns, and natural lakes, and cool vales, the lowing of oxen, and soft slumbers beneath the trees—all are theirs.

For Virgil, the remarkable feature of this lifestyle is that it comes as a spontaneous 'gift' of nature (2.460 *fundit humo facilem victum iustissima tellus*, "most righteous Earth, unbidden, pours forth from her soil an easy sustenance"), not—at least in the ostensible ideology of this passage—as a man-made construction.

³¹ But *graminis herbae* harks back to *graminis ... herbam* in Virg. *Ecl.* 5.26, thus alerting to the imminent metamorphosis of the landscape engineered by Orpheus.

As he turns Ovid's negatives around once again, Seneca shows that he is fully aware of the constructedness of the ideal landscape he picks apart. In his tormented description all the wonderful features traditionally associated with the *locus amoenus* disappear—but they were *artificial* features to begin with. Rather than indulging in the rhetorical inversion of a well-known trope, Seneca seems to be engaged in a more radical demystification: by taking away one by one all the components of the *locus amoenus*, he restores nature to its less glamorous, but more realistic, aspect. There is no room, in his tragedies, for any real belief in the Golden Age, and little space for the amenities of an idyllic landscape, just as there can be no room for the elegiac discourse of love which elects this type of landscape as its preferred setting.

Through a sophisticated twist on a standard mode of description Seneca conveys at once two different, related intuitions: he debunks the founding myth of *locus amoenus* by showing its artificiality,³² and invites a reading of mythical tragedies as the one realistic take on the vicissitudes of mankind. Seneca's insistence on the unpleasant aspects of the natural setting revels, as we have noted, in the possibilities offered by pathetic fallacy, but is also a sobering lesson in cosmological realism. His anti-idyllic landscape seems to take on board Lucretius' disenchanting anti-providentialist view of the earth as an inhospitable planet (5.200–217), greedily covered by *montes silvaeque ferarum*, “mountains and forests full of wild beasts” (5.201), *rupes vastaeque paludes*, “rocks and vasty marshes” (5.202), enormous oceans (5.203), aggressive thorny bushes (5.207). The alternative which Lucretius himself puts forth in his own influential take on the *locus amoenus*—philosophical discussion among friends in a soothing natural setting (2.29–33), as canonically pictured in Plato's *Phaedrus*³³—is not available in a world dominated by extreme passion, by *Libido victrix*, “victorious Lust” (*Thy.* 46), rather than the Lucretian *alma Venus*.³⁴ Lucretius' philosophical idyll is aspirational, and as such fraught with uncertainty, constantly at the mercy of hostile nature. Seneca's abandonment of pastoral scenery removes any margin of illusion, and irrevocably distances itself from the allure of the Epicurean *kepos*.

³² A similar case of generic competition fought around the *locus*' artificial nature is discussed by Sens in this volume, pp. 152–158.

³³ 230b–c.

³⁴ 2.32–33 (*anni / tempora conspergunt viridantis floribus herbas*, quoted above, p. 432) echo Nature's reaction to the arrival of Venus in 1.7–8: *tibi suavis daedala tellus / summittit flores*, “for you the wonder-working earth puts forth sweet flowers”.

The attempt at portraying a *locus amoenus* in the *Phaedra* simply confirms the impossibility of Senecan pastoral. Hippolytus' manifesto in defense of life in the woods (483–564) contains a standard description of a *locus amoenus* at its centre (508–517):

... *hinc aves querulae fremunt*
ramique ventis lene percussi tremunt

veteresque fagi. iuvat <et> aut amnis vagi
pressisse ripas, caespite aut nudo leves
duxisse somnos, sive fons largus citas
defundit undas, sive per flores novos
fugiente dulcis murmurat rivo sonus.
excussa silvis poma compescunt famem
et fraga parvis vulsa dumetis cibos
faciles ministrant.

on one side plaintive birds clamour, and branches tremble at the winds' gentle buffeting ... and ancient beech trees. He delights too to lie on the bank of a wandering river, or to take a light sleep on the bare turf, whether a spring pours out swift waters in profusion, or through fresh flowers a sweet sound murmurs from a fleeting brook. Fruits shaken from trees check his hunger, and wild strawberries plucked from little bushes provide easy food.

But this impassioned speech, a valiant attempt at reshaping rural idyll as a still attainable Golden Age, is too close to the anxieties of contemporary urban life (witness the excessive protestations conveyed by the relentless string of negatives at 486–491³⁵), and too radical in rejecting them, to qualify as a credible alternative to the passionate excesses of *Phaedra* herself rather than the untenable and tragically ironic defense of a “landscape of deluded innocence, of purity about to be lost to sexual violence in the background”.³⁶

4. *Bacchic horror*

The tragedies' landscape of horrors restores many features of the physical world to their unvarnished reality, and shows in the process that a more appealing description had been based on mystification. To be

³⁵ The parallel with Thyestes' words, at *Thy.* 455–470, also heavily sprinkled with negatives, is hardly reassuring.

³⁶ Cf. Segal (1986) 68, with Littlewood (2004) 259–301.

sure, not even the most compelling *locus amoenus* is actually free of potential dangers, its very peacefulness an antiphrastic backdrop for violation and violence³⁷ from the earliest stages of Latin literature.³⁸ From Virgil's countryside to Ovid's mythological settings, such places are always exposed to the harshness of external reality or the dangers of divine presence. Indeed, *loca* can be *amoena* only in a freeze-frame: as narrative enters them, they are constantly at risk of turning into the paradoxically luxurious setting for disaster and death. The codification of the *locus amoenus* clings (desperately) onto a radical erasure of time, and the editing out of all dangers past and future—even the archetypal Tempe is but a precarious oasis in the midst of a harsh countryside.

The dialectics of danger and illusion within an idyllic landscape are best exemplified by one of the most important components of such *loca*, the cave, a standard place of rest (and poetry) in pastoral settings. Caves and grottoes boast a more complex genealogy than their tame presence in idyllic descriptions would suggest, since they are, in origin, the uncanny dwellings of the numinous. As such they can become the unthreatening fixture of a *locus amoenus* only if their intrinsic dangers are forgotten or removed. Once again Ovid offers a sophisticated take on this transformation. In Book 3 of the *Metamorphoses* he presents Diana's grotto as a perfect instance of *locus amoenus*, complete with gently bubbling waters and grass (3.155–164). As Actaeon unwittingly enters the *antra*, "grottoes" (3.177), however, he discovers that the traditional association of (dangerous) divinities with grottoes is well justified. Ovid painstakingly denies that the grotto is entirely natural, *arte laboratum nulla*, "wrought by no artist's hand" (3.158), and that, if anything, it was nature which had imitated art (3.158–159 *simulaverat artem / ingenio natura suo*, "nature by her own cunning had imitated art"). The use of negatives at l. 158 invites to look more closely at the implications of the statement, whose interest goes beyond the usual interplay of nature and art. On the one hand, in fact, Ovid implies that the pleasant and harmonious aspect of the cave is due to its quasi-artistic appearance; on the other, that not even an artistic rearrangement of natural features can altogether elide the intrinsic numinousness, and the attending risks, of the grotto. The illusion of pleasantness and safety which the narrative invites us at first to associate with this *antrum* is artificial: it is a clever, but only temporary, extension to the reality of nature of

³⁷ See esp. Segal (1969), expanding in this respect upon Parry (1964).

³⁸ Ilia's dream in Ennius' *Annales* (39–40 Skutsch).

the illusions and hopes of human *ars*. Just a few lines later Actaeon realizes that *antra* fully preserve their primeval connection with uncontrollable forces. The parenthetical nature of the illusion is made clear in retrospect by the opening of the episode, which describes, if not a full-fledged *locus horridus*, a non-idyllic landscape where the *umbrae* of pastoral are unpleasantly shrunk (3.143–147).

Seneca's *loca horrida* are dotted with *antra* and *speluncae*, which of course retain none of the pleasantness of *loca amoena* and are actually central to the most upsetting actions of the plays. In this respect, too, Seneca can be seen to be turning one of the central corollaries of the founding myth of the *locus amoenus* on its head: it is not the case that the ideal landscape can suddenly become a dangerous setting; on the contrary, idyll exists only as long as dangers are removed from the natural world. Caves are 'horrific' because they were so from the very beginning, before a great deal of *ingenium* and *ars* managed to metamorphose them, unexpectedly, into the superficially reassuring site of pastoral.

Seneca's long-distance polemics on caves and their overall place in the idyllic landscape and connected poetic tradition offers an interesting angle on the role that *topothesia* plays in the tragedies—not a display of rhetorical prowess, but a privileged locus for literary dialectics. Indeed, as we will see shortly, the literary implications of Seneca's use of the *locus horridus* in particular can be usefully broadened. Before doing so, however, we should continue to explore Seneca's *antra* and *specus*, where more than literary polemics is at stake.

Caves of various kinds abound in the tragedies. In *Thyestes* a *specus* (681) is at the heart of Atreus' *penetrabile regni*, "the inner sanctum of the realm" (652), where he secludes himself to draw inspired knowledge about the future of his race, and to commit his crimes,³⁹ an 'uncanny' return to the past (note the collection of family heirlooms ominously dotting the place at 659–664) and an attempt to forestall any future attack on his lineage.⁴⁰ An *antrum* plays an important role in the *Heracles*' underworld, or in the evocation scene in *Oedipus*, but caves also feature in several other plays.⁴¹ Caves are represented, in all these cases,

³⁹ Tiberius' Capri offers an interesting take both on real-life tyrannical *loca horrida* and on 'pastoral'.

⁴⁰ Schiesaro (2003) 93–94.

⁴¹ *Thy.* 681 (see above); *Her.O.* 262, 486; *Tr.* 519–521; as a key feature of Tartarus: *Ag.* 2; *Trö.* 9, 105, 430; *Phoen.* 1201.

as the most important feature of the underworldly (literal or otherwise) landscape, and as such they should not be filed away merely as traditional signposts. Roman culture is notoriously obsessed with *antra*, be they the original, frightening feature of a primitive landscape where the numinous is revealed, or the more stylized garden-variety decoration of estates and parks.

A text from Seneca's own time, the description of the Cilician *specus* in Pomponius Mela⁴² (the only 'speleological' account in Latin literature),⁴³ offers a striking parallel with the features and connotations of his tragic *antra*. The *specus* is sublime (*mirificus ac pulcher*, "extraordinary and beautiful"), since its overall effect is to "astonish" (*consternare*) visitors and "not to let them refrain from viewing it, as soon as they get used to it" (*adeo mirificus ac pulcher ut mentes accedentium, primo aspectu, consternet, ubi contemplari duravere non satiet*), because of its combination of height, vastness, darkness, asperity. Later on, tight passages cause claustrophobic sensations. An *ingens amnis, ingenti fonte se extollens*, "a mighty river rising from a mighty spring", runs at the bottom, which however *iterum demersus absconditur*, "again plunges down and disappears". The descent must end, but *intra spatium est, magis quam ut progredi quisquam ausit horribile et ideo incognitum*, "inside, there is a space too hair-raising for anyone to dare to go forward, and for that reason it remains unknown". Note Pomponius' conclusion: *totus autem <specus> augustus et vere sacer habitarique a diis et dignus et creditus, nihil non venerabile et quasi cum aliquo numine se ostentat*, "the whole cave, however, being narrow and truly sacred, both worthy of being inhabited by gods and believed to be so, reveals nothing that is not venerable, and it reveals itself as if with some kind of numinous power". *Sacer*, "consecrated to a deity", not *sanctus*, "holy", as the venue for a "hiérophanie brute",⁴⁴ inaccessible to human mediation and reassuring personifications.

Horrid *antra* play an important role in Dionysiac rituals as venues for the *katabasis* of the initiated. The aura of moral excess and disapprobation which surrounds Dionysiac rituals connotes this practice, too, with a negative moral element.⁴⁵ Roman Bacchic rites appear to be even more 'brutal'⁴⁶ than their Hellenistic counterparts as they restore

⁴² *Chorographia* 1.72–75 (English translations quoted below are by E.E. Romer).

⁴³ Lavagne (1988) 190–194, at 190.

⁴⁴ Lavagne (1988) 194.

⁴⁵ Lavagne (1988) 178. On the negative appropriation of the 'excessive' features of Oriental Greek cults see Hunter in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 477–485.

⁴⁶ Lavagne (1988) 180.

a link with the traditional practices of agrarian magic, fertility rites and instinctive hunting.⁴⁷ Omophagy lurks in the background, thus establishing an interesting connection with a quintessential Senecan context, the description of Atreus' own 'rites'.⁴⁸

Seneca's caves attempt to capture and convey the immanent numinousness of nature, and restore to it the feeling of awe which had gradually been eroded. As extreme manifestations of the *horror* and *voluptas*, "shuddering" and "delight", caused by the landscape, they are central to a poetics of the sublime which replaces the actions of traditional gods with the brutal force of more primitive pulsions, and a poetics which for this very reason is truly 'Bacchic'.⁴⁹ Not only caves, however, are central elements of a 'Dionysiac landscape'. In fact many aspects of the *locus horridus* can be directly connected with the pathos-filled backdrop to Maenadic ecstasy which has its mastertext in the mountainous setting of Euripides' *Bacchae*.⁵⁰ Mountains, a consistent object of fright in Western culture until the Romantic revolution, tips the balance between *horror* and *divina voluptas* firmly in the latter's favour,⁵¹ are the appropriate setting for the extreme emotions inspired by Dionysus, since they force upon the landscape a contrast between 'high' and 'low' which embodies the extreme emotions experienced by unrequited lovers, Maenads, and poets willing to undergo dangerous ascents in the pursuit of their inspiration. It is precisely *in remotis ... rupibus*, "on distant crags" that Horace will meet Bacchus as he teaches Nymphs and Satyrs (*C.* 2.19.1); in 3.25 the poet is dragged into caves by the force of Bacchic inspiration: *quo me, Bacche, rapis, tui / plenum? quae nemora aut quos agor in specus / velox ...?*, "whither, o Bacchus, do you carry me away, overflowing with your power? Into what groves or grottoes am I swiftly driven ...?"⁵²

The Dionysiac connotation of *antra* and mountains alerts us to the literary implications of Seneca's *loca horrida* as places of poetic inspiration. This is clear in *Oedipus*, where Tiresias evokes tragedy from the dead, but also in *Thyestes*, where the exploration of the *locus horridus* is reserved to a strongly metadramatic character such as Atreus. Poetry, a certain

⁴⁷ Lavagne (1988) 180.

⁴⁸ Schiesaro (2003) 85.

⁴⁹ Schiesaro (2003) 133–138.

⁵⁰ A setting evoked by Oedipus at the beginning of *Phoenissae*, ll. 15–18.

⁵¹ Nicolson (1959); Schama (1995) 447–513.

⁵² Cf. 3.3–4 *quibus / antris*, "in what caves", and the extreme mountain landscape described at 3.8–14 (see also below, n. 59).

kind of poetry, resides in the innermost recesses of the earth, where the world of the living meets with that of the dead, in a landscape which is thoroughly chthonic.⁵³

In endowing caves and secluded groves with inspiring powers, Seneca follows a set of associations already explored by earlier poets. As he seeks to draw inspiration from the Manes of Callimachus and Philetas, Propertius pictures them together in a *nemus* and an *antrum* (3.1.1–6):

*Callimachi Manes et Coi sacra Philetæ,
in vestrum, quaeso, me sinite ire nemus.
primus ego ingredior puro de fonte sacerdos
Italia per Graios orgia ferre choros.
dicite, quo pariter carmen tenuastis in antro?
quove pede ingressi? quamve bibistis aquam?*

Shade of Callimachus and rites of Coan Philetas, suffer me, I pray, to come into your grove. I am the first to enter, priest from an unsullied spring, bringing Italy's mystic emblems in dances of Greece. Say, in what grotto did ye together spin the delicate thread of your song? With what foot enter? What water drink?

This imagery is picked up again in 3.3, where the poet's *antrum* turns into the *spelunca* of the Muses. Calliope can now instruct Propertius on the type of poetry he should pursue (3.3.27–30):

*hic erat affixis viridis spelunca lapillis,
pendebantque cavis tympana pumicibus,
orgia Musarum et Sileni patris imago
fictilis et calami, Pan Tegeæ, tui.*

Here was a green grotto lined with mosaics and from the hollow pumice timbrels hung, the mystic instruments of the Muses, a clay image of father Silenus, and your pipe, o Tegean Pan.

Both poems elaborate on the association between poetic inspiration and prophetic revelation, an activity which takes place in *antra* and *nemora*.⁵⁴

Ovid, too, stages a debate between Tragedy and Elegy in a similar setting (*Am.* 3.1.1–4):

*Stat vetus et multos incaedua silva per annos;
credibile est illi numen inesse loco.
fons sacer in medio speluncaque pumice pendens,
et latere ex omni dulce queruntur aves.*

⁵³ Schiesaro (2003) 85–98.

⁵⁴ Luck (1957).

Ancient, and spared by the axe through many years, there stands a grove; you could believe a deity indwelt the place. A sacred spring is in its midst, and a cave with overhanging rock, and from every side comes the sweet complaint of birds.

As Ovid ponders explicitly on the intrinsic numinousness of the *spelunca*, he does so, at l. 2, in a manner which anticipates the overall tongue-in-cheek development of the rest of the poem.⁵⁵

The thematic prominence of extreme *loca horrida* in Seneca's plays, however, encapsulates both a polemical stance *vis à vis* a well-rehearsed topos and its ironic deployment, and a gesture of allegiance towards a different brand of poetics. As these *loca* develop, on the authority of a strong tradition, a perceptible metaliterary dimension, they become the visible embodiment of a new poetics—the poetics of Dionysiac sublime. “Longinus” himself offers two direct indications in this direction, first as he comments on the “battle of the gods” in *Iliad* 20–21 (*ad Il.* 21.388 and 20.61–65; *sublim.* 9.6):

ἐπιβλέπεις, ἑταῖρε, ὥς ἀναρρηγνυμένης μὲν ἐκ βάθρων γῆς, αὐτοῦ δὲ γυνουμένου ταρτάρου, ἀνατροπὴν δὲ ὅλου καὶ διάστασιν τοῦ κόσμου λαμβάνοντος, πάνθ' ἅμα, οὐρανὸς ἕδης, τὰ θνητὰ τὰ ἀθάνατα, ἅμα τῇ τότε συμπολεμεῖ καὶ συγκινδυνεύει μάχῃ;

Do you see how the earth is torn from its foundations, Tartarus laid bare, and the whole universe overthrown and broken up, so that all things—Heaven and Hell, things mortal and things immortal—share the warfare and the perils of that ancient battle?⁵⁶

and then as he includes extreme landscapes among the signs of the sublime (35.4):

ἔνθεν φυσικῶς πως ἀγόμενοι μὰ Δί' οὐ τὰ μικρὰ ῥεῖθρα θαυμάζομεν, εἰ καὶ διαυγῇ καὶ χρήσιμα, ἀλλὰ τὸν Νεῖλον καὶ Ἰστρον ἢ Ῥῆνον, πολὺ δ' ἔτι μᾶλλον τὸν Ὠκεανόν· οὐδέ γε τὸ ὑφ' ἡμῶν τουτὶ φλογίον ἀνακαίόμενον, ἐπεὶ καθαρὸν σφύζει τὸ φέγγος, ἐκπληττόμεθα τῶν οὐρανίων μᾶλλον, καίτοι πολλάκις ἐπισκοτούμενων, οὐδὲ τῶν τῆς Αἴτνης κρατήρων ἀξιοθανμαστότερον νομίζομεν, ἥς αἱ ἀναχοαὶ πέτρους τε ἐκ βυθοῦ καὶ ὅλους ὄχθους ἀναφέρουσι καὶ ποταμοὺς ἐνίοτε τοῦ γηγενοῦς ἐκείνου καὶ αὐτομάτου προχέουσι πυρός.

It is a natural inclination that leads us to admire not the little streams, however pellucid and however useful, but the Nile, the Danube, the Rhine, and above all the Ocean. Nor do we feel so much awe before

⁵⁵ On the metaliterary connotation of the Massilian *silva* and its desecration in Lucan (3.399–452), see Masters (1992) 25–29.

⁵⁶ Translation by D.A. Russell.

the little flame we kindle, because it keeps its light clear and pure, as before the fires of heaven, though they are often obscured. We do not think our flame more worthy of admiration than the craters of Etna, whose eruptions bring up rocks and whole hills out of the depths, and sometimes pour forth rivers of the earth-born, spontaneous fire.⁵⁷

Explicit connections with *De sublimitate* are of course suggestive,⁵⁸ but “Longinus” indications simply restate in explicit, theoretical terms a truth which poets such as Horace and especially Lucretius had already put into practice.

Seneca’s *loca horrida* are instances of the sublime—first of all for the violent spatial (and, to a lesser extent, temporal) dislocation they convey. High mountains with overhanging rocks, or the depths of Acheron, sweep the reader away in a flight of the mind, and the sudden perception of vast expanses of space, especially when coupled with the vertiginous effect of an abyss, cannot fail to produce in the viewer the physical sensation of *horror*, a sensation where the boundaries between fear and pleasure are elusive, witness Lucretius’ famous *divina voluptas / ... atque horror*, “divine delight and a shuddering” (3.28–29). While Dionysiac connotations are not foreign to Lucretius, they become explicit in Horace’s Bacchic *dulce periculum*, “sweet danger” (*C.* 3.25.18), the extreme emotion experienced by the poet as he is dragged away (3.25.1 *rapis*, “you carry away”)⁵⁹ in Dionysiac ecstasy. Needless to say, the evocation of the dead is in itself archetypally φοβερόν, “frightening”. A text by Seneca, however, is more important in this connection than “Longinus” statement, since *Letter* 41 deals at length with what the author defines as the *speciosum ex horrido*, “impressive because of the wild appearance”, an aesthetic category including those objects which cannot “be regarded without fear” (41.6 *sine timore aspici*). The letter is especially intriguing for its systematic combination of ethics and aesthetics. Seneca plans to demonstrate the assumption that *sacer intra nos spiritus sedet*, “a holy spirit indwells within us” (41.2), but proceeds to do so by offering first of all instances of immanent numinousness in the physical

⁵⁷ A landmark of the ancient sublime (boasting, *inter alia*, a short poem wholly devoted to itself), and of the modern cult of ‘terribilità’, thanks to a popular painting by Salvator Rosa (Schama (1995) 456).

⁵⁸ Further remarks on “Longinus” and Seneca in Schiesaro (2003) 127–132.

⁵⁹ A comparable train of thought, and similar imagery, in *C.* 2.19 (quoted above, p. 443), where Bacchus teaches poetry “on distant crags” (*in remotis carmina rupibus*, l. 1), for which a Neronian picture provides an interesting point of reference (MN 9488, in Croisille (1982) plate 78.1).

world. His strategy emerges early on (41.2) from his tendentious use of a Virgilian quote: *in unoquoque virorum bonorum* “(*quis deus incertum est*) *habitat deus*”. The Virgilian tag comes from a well-known description of a *locus horridus* in Book 8 of the *Aeneid* (351–354):

*“hoc nemus, hunc” inquit “frondoso vertice collem
(quis deus incertum est) habitat deus; Arcades ipsum
credunt se vidisse Iovem, cum saepe nigrantem
aegida concuteret dextra nimbosque cerneret.”*

“This grove” he cries “this hill with its leafy crown—though we know not what god it is—is yet a god’s home; my Arcadians believe they have looked on Jove himself, when, as often happens, his right hand has shaken the darkening aegis and summoned the storm clouds”.

Seneca returns to the correct *Aeneid* context as he then offers his own version of a numinous *lucus*, one φοβερόν enough to elicit thoughts of religious awe in the spectators (*Letter* 41.3):

si tibi occurrerit vetustis arboribus et solitam altitudinem egressis frequens lucus et conspectum caeli <densitate> ramorum aliorum alios protegentium summovens, illa proceritas silvae et secretum loci et admiratio umbrae in aperto tam densae atque continuae fidem tibi numinis faciet.

If ever you have come upon a grove that is full of ancient trees which have grown to an unusual height, shutting out a view of the sky by the thickness of branches covering each other, then the loftiness of the forest, the seclusion of the spot, and your marvel at the thick unbroken shade in the midst of the open spaces, will prove to you the presence of deity.

The same effect will be caused by another well-known feature of the *locus horridus* (41.3):

si quis specus saxis penitus exesis montem suspenderit, non manu factus, sed naturalibus causis in tantam laxitatem excavatus, animum tuum quadam religionis suspitione percutiet.

If a cave, made by the deep crumbling of the rocks, holds up a mountain on its arch, a place not built with hands but hollowed out into such spaciousness by natural causes, your soul will be deeply moved by a certain intimation of the existence of god.

A man who is *interritus periculis* and *intactus cupiditatibus*, “unterrified in the midst of dangers” (41.4) will inspire viewers with the same sensation of the sublime which is caused by extraordinary natural features. Note that the adjective *altus* (“lofty”, 41.4), used here to define an exceptional moral fibre which “cannot stand without the help of a divine power” (41.5 *non potest res tanta sine adminiculo numinis stare*), also applies, like its

Greek counterpart ὑψηλός, to a “sublime” style vehement and full of emotions, so much so that its practitioners may be seen enthused with Bacchic furor.⁶⁰

Seneca offers an explicit belief in the presence of the numinous in certain manifestations of nature, those which are *speciosa ex horrido* because extreme, and, of course, ‘not hand-made’, and in so doing he formulates a poetic programme which attempts to recapture the emotions of numinousness—which in the tragedies is almost invariably declined as the uncanny return of repressed feelings, crimes and ghosts—in a suitably powerful style. The *loca horrida* which attract so much attention in the tragedies attempt to restore to a non-idealized landscape the numinousness with which it had traditionally been endowed, and thus to compensate for—or perhaps to put into sharper relief—the absence, relative or absolute, of traditional gods as guarantors of a moral order in a world dominated by unrestrained passions.

Seneca’s attitude is consistent with a basic assumption of the Stoic view of the universe, which argues for the presence of the divine in the physical world. But there is one further dimension of interest in his exploitation of *loca horrida* as important nexus of meaning. Both an incidental remark in *Letter* 41.3 (*non manu factus, sed naturalibus causis*, quoted above), and the interpretation offered above about the polemical undertone of the use of negative description in *loca horrida*, underline Seneca’s continuing concerns about the contrast between *natura* and *ars* in artistic creation, which Ovid had highlighted as a central issue of *topothe-siae*. In the context of this long-distance debate, Seneca endeavours to restore deeper significance to *loca horrida* as venues for the epiphany of the numinous and sources of ‘chthonic’ poetry and pre-rational knowledge.⁶¹ His move is all the more remarkable since it takes place while in Rome many caves and sacred groves, long the preserve of *numina*,

⁶⁰ The orator M. Calidius excelled in “instructing” (*docere*) and “pleasing” (*delectare*) his audience, but did not “excite” it (*movere*): *ab erat tertia illa laus, qua permoveret atque incitaret animos, quam plurimum pollere diximus, nec erat ulla vis atque contentio: sive consilio, quod eos, quorum altior oratio actioque esset ardentior, furere et bacchari arbitretur, sive quod natura non esset ita factus ...*, “the third merit, which consists in moving the listener and in arousing his emotions—the orator’s chief source of power, as I have said—he lacked, and he was in fact quite without force and intensity. This may have been due to deliberate choice, as of one holding that a more elevated style and a more vehement delivery were frenzy and delirium, or to a natural indisposition to that sort of things” (Cic. *Brutus* 276).

⁶¹ On the tradition of “boschi sacri” in the Renaissance and beyond see Schama (1995) 534–536.

are actually stripped of their ritual significance and turned into urban gardens,⁶² or decorations⁶³ for suburban villas. As he declares his allegiance to a form of poetry which is allied with the regressive forces of the unconscious, Seneca also harks back to a pre-modern belief in the numinousness of *loca horrida*: the friction between the elaborate rhetorical predictability of many (not all) of his descriptions and this 'rétro' ideological move encapsulates one of the productive paradoxes of his tragic poetry.

Loca horrida, to be sure, encapsulate more than one tension. They become the manifesto for the poetics of Dionysiac sublime, veering significantly away from the reassuring role which caves and woods play as a backdrop to poetic inspiration; they (re-)establish a connection between revelation and poetic inspiration by making it clear that the poetry arising from such chthonic, frightening settings will bring to light unwelcome truths and repressed feelings; and, finally, suggest a nostalgic counterpoint to the excesses of contemporary artistic refinement, which so privilege tame *ars vis à vis* mind-blowing emotions.⁶⁴ It is easy to regard such intense virtuoso descriptions as the trademark of the 'Silver' poet par excellence, but we should on the whole beware of such a neat periodization, since the search for 'baroque' poetic sublime involved 1st cent. BC poets (and artists⁶⁵) as well. The intertextual dialogue with Virgil and Ovid which is a core component of his *loca horrida* shows that Seneca already found anxiety and horror in his predecessors' landscapes,⁶⁶ and proceeds to explode any remaining illusion even as pastoral poetry (albeit in a different shape) makes a bold comeback.⁶⁷

⁶² Grimal (1969) 165–171.

⁶³ I cannot deal here with representations of landscape in 1st-cent. art, for which see Croisille (1982), esp. 192–195 on the sacred-idyllic landscape, and the relative abundance of painted landscapes in the last period of Pompeian art, and 378–400 on Seneca; see now also Varner (2000). On sacred-idyllic landscapes in Augustan poetry see Leach (1988) 197–260. On Ovid's invention of caves see Barchiesi in this volume, pp. 422–423.

⁶⁴ On the archetypal value of Seneca's *loca horrida* for a rich vein of subsequent literature see Orlando (1993) 207–211, 411–413.

⁶⁵ On Augustan sculpture see Settis (1999) 56–63.

⁶⁶ On Virgilian sublime see Heinze (1993) 377–384; on Ovid see Segal (1969).

⁶⁷ On Calpurnius Siculus, see Mayer's contribution in this volume.

LATIN PASTORAL AFTER VIRGIL

ROLAND MAYER

No poet known to us was rash enough to mount a serious challenge to Virgil in the pastoral genre in his lifetime. Indeed a couple of generations were to pass after the publication of the *Bucolica* before Calpurnius Siculus, early in the reign of Nero (a contested dating, as we shall see), picked up the oaten flute again. Nor was he alone: an anonymous poet (or possibly poets) joined him in a revival and redefinition of the genre. But whilst the genre itself had to wait some time to be recovered, the pastoral mode which Virgil introduced into Latin literature was exploited by a number of his contemporaries, and indeed by himself in the seventh book of the heroic epic *Aeneid*: the Italy to which Aeneas and his followers come as refugees is depicted in pastoral hues.¹ Before we review the post-Virgilian pastoralists, two poets whose response to the *Bucolica* seems to have been immediate require brief notice.

According to Suetonius in his *Life of Virgil* (§43), an otherwise unknown writer, Numitorius, composed two eclogues under the title *Antibucolica*. He appears from the snippets quoted by Suetonius to have been exercised by linguistic issues, not liking some of Virgil's expressions; the form he adopted was parodistic. The appearance of this response so soon after publication demonstrates the success Virgil enjoyed: parodists do not waste their time on non-entities. More substantial than Numitorius' is the response of the anonymous poet of the *Dirae* ("Curses").

The *Dirae* is transmitted to us in a collection nowadays known as the *Appendix Vergiliana*. The poems in the collection are by a number of writers, all unknown even in antiquity, who were working at quite different times; the collection was made on the assumption, manifestly impossible for some of the pieces, that they all were early works of Virgil's. The *Dirae* certainly seems contemporary with the *Bucolica*. The

¹ For this see Wimmel (1987) 222–234.

setting of the poem is pastoral: the singer, whilst chiefly a farmer, herds goats (ll. 91–94), and sings to an oaten flute, *avena* (l. 7). The poem is formally a curse, or rather the repetition of a curse, addressed to Batarus, and made by the shepherd-farmer upon his own lands, which have been expropriated by a land-commission (cf. *pertica*, “measuring rod”, l. 45), and assigned to a demobilized soldier, called Lycurgus (*militis*, l. 31, and cf. ll. 80–81). This reflects exactly the same situation as Virgil’s first and ninth eclogues. Fraenkel (1966) 153 indeed believed that it was a phrase in the sixth line of the latter poem—*quod nec vertat bene*, “and may that not turn out well”—which inspired the anonymous poet to compose a more elaborate curse upon the interloper. But the curse, which Watson (1991) 153–154 argues owes little to the purely literary tradition, is the more moving in that the farmer damns his own beloved land to sterility. Fraenkel (1966) 154 felt that the poem as a whole showed little awareness of the realities of political struggle, and that its inspiration was largely due to the success of Virgil’s pastorals, which the anonymous poet sought to capitalize on. Perhaps so. But the absence of any purely literary elaboration (there are no mythical allusions, no colour borrowed from the Greek pastoral tradition) and the intense attachment to the land argue instead for the poem’s origin in the composer’s own feelings about land expropriation. The poem suffers from artistic infelicities (the curse is not spontaneous, its language is repetitive and at times obscure), but the writer’s sense of outrage is real enough. This is an entirely original piece, and gives us some notion of what we have lost in having so little of the minor writing of antiquity. For our present purpose, the poem is also proof of the rapid appreciation of Virgil’s own achievement.

Virgil’s friend, Horace, clearly admired his *Bucolica* and produced a witty and subversive ‘homage’ in his famous second epode. This poem seems to be a personal reverie on the charms of rural life, and much language and colour is drawn from Virgil’s pastorals (and his didactic *Georgics* too). But there is a surprise ending: at l. 67 Horace makes it clear that all along he has been ‘quoting’ the reflections of a moneylender named Alfius. Amusing as the poem is, it embodies what Gifford (1999) 1 recognized as the fundamental pastoral movement of “retreat and return”, a movement best seen in the figure of Gallus in Virgil’s *Ecl.* 10. Alfius proposes to become a countryman (*futurus rusticus*, l. 68), and the reverie depicts his ideal, certainly a mistaken one, of what life in the country will be like. So he calls in all his debts

with a view to “retreat” onto the land (a move approved by the Elder Cato). But the plan is never to be realized, once he “returns” to his old ways by lending out his money all over again. (Indeed it would be no idle pun to speak of his return as a true *reditus*, since that Latin word also means financial “return”, revenue.) Virgil’s pastoral ideal influenced Horace again in the sixteenth epode, where the imagery of the Golden Age is redeployed in contrast with the contemporary strife of civil war.²

Horace was not alone in his admiration of Virgilian pastoral. The contemporary erotic elegist, Tibullus, ‘rusticated’ the essentially urban code of elegy by dreaming of love in the country; his very first elegy strikes this unusual note. Like Horace, he too picks up Virgil’s ideal of the Golden Age (1.3.35–48), as a contrast to the grim reality of warfare. Tibullus’ work in turn influenced Propertius, who tries his hand at a recodification of elegy, by joining his mistress in a rustic retreat (2.19). The contrast between town and country is particularly stressed, and Propertius expresses satisfaction that once in the country his mistress will be out of the way of urban temptations (shows, and trysting places). Like Virgil’s Gallus, he fancies he’ll do some hunting (*ipse ego venabor*, l. 17), not great big lions or wild boars of course (too dangerous), but hares and birds.

One last poet’s engagement with the pastoral mode deserves a word. Ovid incorporated many poetic modes in his kaleidoscopic *Metamorphoses*, and the bucolic world is certainly not neglected, particularly in the tales of Pan and of Narcissus.³

1. *Titus Calpurnius Siculus*

We may now turn to the revival of the pastoral genre itself early in the principate of Nero. To set the scene, it needs to be recalled how welcome was his accession to the throne. His adoptive father, Claudius, whilst far from being a tyrant, had certainly stained his reputation with bloodshed. When he died, or was assassinated, in the autumn of 54 AD, great hopes were entertained that the young and handsome Nero—he was eighteen—would usher in a new age. The accomplished

² See Mankin (1995) for fuller discussion of both of these poems.

³ See Griffin (1999) and Hardie (2002) 121–132. On the pastoral element in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, see Barchiesi, this volume, pp. 403ff.

courtier, Seneca (who was also Nero's teacher of oratory), composed a mordant satire upon the dead Claudius, in which the Fates spin out on fine thread the return of the Golden Age (*aurea formoso descendunt saecula filo*: *Apocol.* 4.1.9).⁴ This announces the return of that age promised in Virgil's *Ecl.* 4. A couple of poets took the hint that Seneca gave, and rehabilitated the pastoral genre, chiefly in its panegyric mood.⁵ We know the name of one of these poets, Calpurnius Siculus,⁶ but the other(s) remain anonymous, and the poems are designated "Einsiedeln Eclogues" from the place of their discovery in Switzerland in 1869. But before we can discuss Calpurnius' poems, it is important to stress that controversy still simmers over the date when he wrote. To put this issue of dating into some sort of perspective, it is fair to say that whenever he wrote, he made a considerable effort to be independent. Much as he owed to Virgil, he is consciously doing something different with the genre, and he has his own agenda. His way with pastoral themes and his craftsmanship are all his own, no matter the age in which he may have written.

Before the mid-19th century Calpurnius was dated to the reign of the emperor Carus (282 AD). It was then demonstrated by Haupt (1875) vol. 1, 358–406 that a number of features of the poetic style of the seven pastorals he ascribed to Calpurnius seemed rather to belong to the mid-1st century. Other, historical details which seemed to offer hints to the time of writing also squared better with that re-dating. Moreover, a Neronian Calpurnius would be of a piece with the wider movement, described by Mayer (1983b), to revive the literary genres introduced or developed by the Augustans. So matters stood until Champlin (1978) reassigned the author to the reign of Alexander Severus; not without counter-arguments, however, as a number of voices were raised against his re-dating and in favour of Haupt.⁷ A third dating later in the 1st century has also been suggested by Courtney (1987). The whole issue of date, which has evoked a lively debate with cham-

⁴ For the praise of Nero in this work and similarities in Calpurnius see Griffin (1976) 132. She also notes (p. 135) that Calpurnius refers at 1.59 to the actions of the divinised abstraction, Clementia; Seneca composed a work with that title in 55–56, as a blueprint for the new regime. 'Clemency' was "part of the publicity of the new reign from the start". Cf. Küppers (1985) 357.

⁵ See Schmidt (1953).

⁶ The *cognomen* (last name), Siculus, has excited some scepticism, since Sicily was traditionally the home of Theocritus, and it has been thought that the name was devised to tie Calpurnius to a pastoral locale, if only out of flattery.

⁷ E.g., Townend (1980), Mayer (1980), and Wiseman (1982).

pions for a range of options, is most recently reviewed and assessed by Horsfall (1997). He concludes, somewhat aporetically, that Calpurnius is probably not a Neronian writer, but indeterminably later, with a fascination for the Neronian period. He rightly stresses that Calpurnius' panegyrics could be applied to any promising young emperor ((1997) 166 and 193).

It is regrettable that many of us who have involved ourselves in this debate over dating have blundered more or less seriously in advancing our own positions. Some examples will clarify this point. Champlin has revisited the historical issues, and he drew attention ((1986) 110–111) to the matter of the public seating at a show, as described by Calpurnius in 7.28–29. The *equites* are there said to be in their own section, and Champlin believes that Tacitus, *Ann.* 15.32 provides a *terminus post quem* of 63 AD for the composition of that poem; Horsfall (1997) 169 accepts the point. But neither of them noticed that Tacitus is relating the assignment of particular seats to the *equites* expressly at the race track (*apud circum*), whereas Calpurnius' venue is quite different, an amphitheatre. That historical notice from Tacitus after all tells us nothing to the point.⁸

Champlin's second essay was accompanied by a more elaborate piece by Armstrong (1986), which aimed to highlight the linguistic and metrical practice of Calpurnius that did not seem to fit comfortably into the Neronian period. His treatment of certain linguistic peculiarities in *Ecl.* 4 is largely dismissed by Schröder (1991) 17 n. 7. More generally his evidence was re-assessed and much of it discounted by Horsfall (1997), who nonetheless on balance agreed that we might feel an unease on stylistic grounds about a Neronian Calpurnius.⁹ When however Horsfall himself (1997) 191 cited the active/middle sense of *reparabilis* at *Ecl.* 5.20 as something not appropriate to the Neronian period he had forgotten that that is exactly how Persius used the word in his first satire, l. 102. This of course once again proves nothing as to date, since Calpurnius did not have to be Persius' contemporary to have read him. But that particular usage is clearly not un-Neronian.

Finally Courtney (1987) 151–156 tried to demonstrate that Calpurnius wrote after Statius. Again, Horsfall (1997) 178–179 poured some useful

⁸ Di Salvo (1990) 29–30 notes that this observation had already been made.

⁹ This sort of judgement can however be very subjective where anomalous usages or constructions are at issue. Salutory caution is enjoined by Kenney (1999). Good writers experiment, and there is no obvious limit to what they may try out.

cold water on aspects of the methodology he employed, but it is possible to go much further and point out that the phrase *flos iuventae*, “flower of youth”, common to Calpurnius, *Ecl.* 2.89 and Statius, *Silu.* 1.2.276, is a cliché, found as much in prose as in verse; that hardly helps us towards deciding priority, even though both writers particularize the facial features (*vultus*) as the seat of youthful flower: nothing very distinctive in that, surely.¹⁰ We may be driven to the unwelcome view that despite the amount of work done on the issue of dating the evidence needs to be sifted and assessed more carefully.

But evidence, or what is thought to pass for it, is not everything. This is a matter that calls for common sense as well. The Calpurnius adumbrated by Horsfall, for instance, is a poet whose deep knowledge of the events and literature of Nero’s reign is deployed in heralding the arrival of a new emperor. We are surely entitled to ask who exactly that might be, and, more to the point, whether he would have been at all pleased to have the beginning of his reign likened to Nero’s. Calpurnius moreover is looking for serious patronage from the new emperor. How could he expect it from one whose new reign he limned in Neronian hues? Finally, once the Flavian amphitheatre was in use after its first dedication in 79 AD, it would have been dotty to pretend that the new emperor went to the trouble and expense of building another such structure for his own spectacles. Calpurnius’ *Ecl.* 7 is the best evidence for his Neronian date.¹¹ To put that another way, a Calpurnius writing later than the reign of Nero is inexplicable. But as was said at the outset, the issue of date has no bearing on Calpurnius’ literary achievement, and to that it is high time to turn.

The careful ordering of the poems to shape the book may be noticed first:¹² there are seven poems, all disposed in a clear design. Formally considered, the second, fourth and sixth are conversational, with no dominant individual. All of the odd numbered poems on the other

¹⁰ For the cliché see *TLL*, vol. 6.1, 74–84. In that context, Horsfall (1997) 185 regards *lana* for the down on a quince at Calpurnius 2.90 and Martial 10.42.3 as technical, so not a token of dependence one way or the other (though there may be a contradiction of his view set out on p. 179).

¹¹ Again, scholars have got themselves into unnecessary difficulties with this poem. Corydon describes what he saw in the amphitheatre, but does not say that these were the inaugural shows, as apparently described by Suetonius, *Nero* 12.1. Nero’s amphitheatre stood for some years and Corydon does not have to have been present at the first spectacles. The differences between Suetonius and Calpurnius prove nothing.

¹² Hubbard (1998) 152–153 and Fey-Wickert (2002) 14–16 give helpful accounts with notice of some alternative schemes and interpretations. Cf. Korzeniewski (1972).

hand have room for a monologue; indeed the fifth is all monologue after the opening four lines. Thematically considered, the second and third are linked by their shared erotic theme, while the first, fourth, and final seventh poems punctuate the span of the whole collection, in that all have panegyric elements, celebrating the new emperor (Sullivan (1985) 51–56, 58–59 and Vinchesi (1996) 13–29 provide crisp analyses of these poems). The first announces the start of his reign and the recovery of political harmony, the last commemorates spectacular games which the shepherd Corydon had the good fortune to see in Rome.

In these three poems panegyric is the keynote, and a discordant one if we share the view of Rosenmeyer (1969) 123–124 that it is incompatible with the simplicity of bucolic. There is something to this criticism. Virgil in his *Ecl.* 4 and 5 (*Ecl.* 8 also starts with an elegant encomium of the unnamed Pollio) had hymned imaginary figures, a “Wunderkind” and the rural benefactor Daphnis, who both might evoke thoughts of historical persons. Calpurnius however has the new emperor of the day plainly in his sights, and for a reason: he seeks his patronage. Calpurnius reserves his fullest praise for the fourth, central and longest, poem of the collection; Schröder (1991) has dedicated a useful commentary to it. The Golden Age returns (*Ecl.* 4.6–7), and the emperor is praised at length (4.82–146). Praise may entail blame (by way of contrast), and Calpurnius does not hesitate to give a political colour to his panegyric, an innovation rightly stressed by Martin (1996). The contrast of the new reign with its predecessor is heralded, especially at *Ecl.* 1.60–73 (the bad treatment of the Senate, the purchase of high office; now the judicial function is to be restored to the consul). But these misfortunes did not affect the pastoral world, as did the land confiscation alluded to by Virgil in his first and ninth eclogues. There is accordingly less of a sense of relief and renewal about the praises of the new reign in Calpurnius’ *Ecl.* 4 than we find in Virgil. What is remarkable about the panegyric element in Calpurnius is its sheer bulk. Three poems out of seven are devoted to the praise of the new reign, and those three all hold prominent positions. We are quite simply in a different world from Virgil’s, in which praise could still be oblique and Callimachean. Whatever the age in which Calpurnius himself wrote, praise clearly had to be unstinted and unsubtle (see Dewar (1994)).

This aspect of the poetry has not gone down well with some modern scholars, chiefly Leach (1973) and (1975), Newlands (1987), Davis (1988), and Vozza (1993) and (1994). They have all sought to dissociate the poet in some way or other from his praise, possibly out of a desire

to detach him from Nero or from the imperial settlement, or simply from his own flattery. But they forget that the early part of Nero's reign, when Calpurnius seems to have been writing, was generally accounted satisfactory; there is no pressing need therefore to detach him from Nero. Moreover, as Fear (1994) has ably demonstrated in regard to the seventh poem, the emperor was expected to entertain the Roman people lavishly. Now that sort of entertainment (beast hunts in the amphitheatre) may not be to modern taste, but there is no hint in the poetry of criticism; indeed, Lycotas is thrilled by what Corydon tells him of the wonders he has witnessed in Rome (cf. *Ecl.* 7.73–75). Finally, it is a simple fact of the literary life at Rome that the less well-to-do poets sought patronage unashamedly; we still have an anonymous poem, contemporary with Calpurnius, which is designed to secure the financial support of an aristocrat (the so-called *Laus Pisonis*). Calpurnius' candour in his search for the most exalted patronage would have been no disgrace to him in Roman terms. What is particularly interesting is that he seeks admission to Nero's circle exclusively on the grounds of his poetic skill. This shows something of the enhanced status that a poet might now claim for himself (indeed the same ploy is used by the author of the *Laus Pisonis*). Calpurnius does not propose to write anything special for the emperor; he looks for support simply on the grounds of what he is.

A frank avowal of the search for higher patronage is thus bound up with the panegyric. Virgil had no more than said that Pollio admired his rustic Muse (*Ecl.* 3.84) and offered, as noted above, oblique praise of his successes as general and poet (*Ecl.* 8.6–13); that sufficed to acknowledge the bond between poet and patron, and to laud the patron. But Calpurnius is keen to rise. He already has a patron, who is given the pastoral name Meliboeus, but he is no more than a stepping-stone to higher things, namely the attention of the new ruler. This ploy is somewhat abruptly introduced in the closing lines of *Ecl.* 1 (92–94), where Meliboeus is named for the first time, and the hope is expressed that he will carry the song *augustas ... ad aures*, “to imperial ears”. Meliboeus' role is fleshed out in *Ecl.* 4: he had provided Corydon with material assistance in the past (ll. 31–49), and thanks to his own literary activities proved a useful critic (ll. 50–57). But he can do still more, if he will bring these pastoral compositions to the divine emperor, or at any rate to his library on the Palatine (ll. 157–159). Meliboeus will then be to Corydon what Maecenas or Pollio had been to Tityrus/Virgil (ll. 160–163). Who lurks behind the name Meliboeus, assuming he is not

himself a generic fiction?¹³ Calpurnius has not given us very clear hints: Meliboeus is something of a tragic and a lyric poet (ll. 55–57), and he has written on weather-signs (whether in verse or prose is not specified, ll. 53–55). Despite these meagre clues, speculation has nonetheless been ample, but focused ultimately on two figures, the nobleman C. Calpurnius Piso, and, most persistently, Seneca the Younger. It is of course quite possible that neither of these figures was in Calpurnius' mind, and certainly the case for neither has been convincingly demonstrated, because the poet's few hints at his identity do not really square with anyone we know of in the early reign of Nero. Seneca, the most promising candidate, did not pursue his interest in natural science until after his retirement from public life in 63 AD, and that is too late (so Schröder (1991) 31–32). If Calpurnius is not Neronian himself, we have completely run out of information about who might be supporting him. But for practical purposes it does not matter who Meliboeus is. What is significant is the now centripetal power of patronage: only the favour of Caesar is worth having. Meliboeus is but an avenue to the throne, but he will not be insulted at his subordinate position. Rather, his own access to the imperial ear is proof of his standing.

Roman poets were unashamed about their place in a particular generic tradition, and Calpurnius frankly avows his Virgilian heritage (*Ecl.* 4.62–63), and his own inferiority to the “holy bard” (*vates sacer*, 4.65), who is a god (4.70).¹⁴ But, as we have seen, he fences off his own bucolic enclave from the outside world. Consistent with this pastoral intensification is the exclusion from the rustic world of a real figure like Gallus in Virgil's *Ecl.* 10. Neither do Calpurnius' pastoral figures show any knowledge of contemporary Romans, the new emperor apart (and he is never named, following the Virgilian precedent of *Ecl.* 1). Calpurnius develops Virgil's deployment of rustic details: Leach (1975) 124–126 and Coleman (1977) 24 noted such features as the Italian colour of the ‘finger game’ (“*morra*”, in modern Italian) at 2.25–27, and the presence of native divinities, Faunus (in his prophetic capacity), Silvanus, Flora and Pomona. At Calpurnius' *Ecl.* 4.25–26, the shepherd who takes his milk to town to sell has an appropriate cry (*non tacitus*); at

¹³ Schröder (1991) 29–34 is the fullest modern account of the debate. Vinchesi (1996) 11–12 wisely says we should renounce attempts at identification.

¹⁴ For an alleged ‘anxiety of influence’ see Slater (1994) and Hubbard (1998) 153–178. Their position is somewhat weakened by a focus upon the panegyric poems and a comparative neglect of the remaining four. Calpurnius is less in Virgil's shadow than he would have us believe.

Ecl. 7.15 there is reference to the festival of Pales. Calpurnius also imitates the rustic language (e.g. *iubilum*, “yodel” at *Ecl.* 1.30, 7.3) and introduces the technical names of rustic workers (*legulus*, “gatherer”, at *Ecl.* 3.49, and *circitor*, “overseer”, at *Ecl.* 5.97). Butler (1909) 151 was unimpressed: “in the seven eclogues of Calpurnius may be found a larger assortment of vegetables, of agricultural implements and operations, than in the *Bucolics* of Vergil”. This seems a bit harsh, but some will agree with a subtle observation of Garson’s (1974) 669 that by creating a gap between his bucolic experience and the wider world Calpurnius sacrificed one of the elements that make Virgil’s pastorals so suggestive. Another suggestive element that Calpurnius does not pick up from Virgil is the notion of Arcadia; the word never appears. Now whether or not Virgil himself actually did have an ‘Arcadian’ ideal has recently been questioned,¹⁵ but no one denies that his pastoral landscape is a heavily idealised one, for all its realistic features. Calpurnius however leaves us with no such impression of his own landscape. It is, as suggested above, more intensely pastoral than Virgil’s, but it is not particularly ideal.

Calpurnius however has his own distinct sensibility and agenda, which are markedly anti-Virgilian. The subtlest, and also one of the first, analyses of his independence is found in the indispensable chapter entitled “Echoes and other noises in the later pastoral” by Damon (1973, but really 1961) 291–298, who demonstrated how Calpurnius consistently undermined Virgil’s primary pastoral images. The woods, for instance, are a place Calpurnius’ Corydon wants to leave (*Ecl.* 4.160 *e silvis*), and *nemorale*, “woodland” is a belittling term (Damon (1973) 296–298). The sounds which fill Virgil’s landscape are either disparaged or silenced in Calpurnius’ countryside, an inversion of Virgil’s auditory imagery (Damon (1973) 292–294). Calpurnius reserves his greatest surprise for his last poem, in which he engineers a remarkable break with the tradition of the ‘return’ to the pastoral landscape.¹⁶ In his seventh poem he sets up a piquant contrast with Virgil’s *Ecl.* 1. In both poems a rustic goes to Rome, and sees a young ruler there. But whereas Virgil’s Tityrus returns eagerly to his pastoral life, Calpurnius’ Corydon is “reluctant to leave Rome” (*lentus ab urbe venis*, *Ecl.* 7.1); that *lentus* must recall the iconic description of Tityrus, *lentus in umbra*, “at ease in the

¹⁵ For Virgil’s Arcadia see above pp. IX–XI.

¹⁶ Effe and Binder (2001) 108–113 offer a tidy discussion of the surprising close to the collection.

shade", in the opening lines of Virgil's *Ecl.* 1. But now, as Damon (1973) 292 says, the pastoral singer was *lentus* whilst in the city; the beech tree under which Tityrus sheltered was described in Virgil's very first line as "spreading" (*patulae*), a word Corydon now transferred to a civic monument, the spreading sand of Nero's amphitheatre (*Ecl.* 7.6). We might add that Corydon somewhat rudely chastises the aged Lycotas for preferring to look at "old beech trees" (*veteres fagos*, *Ecl.* 7.5) rather than the new shows to be seen at Rome; such ancient beech trees were a feature of Virgil's pastoral landscape (cf. *Ecl.* 3.12 and 9.9). There could hardly be a clearer, or brusquer, repudiation of the pastoral world. All in all, the seventh poem stages an extraordinary reversal of pastoral values on which to end the collection: the city trumps the country. It is not that the city and its values have encroached upon the pastoral world (as happens, say, in Virgil's *Ecl.* 2); rather, the discontent of the shepherd is owed to his failure to stay within his own world. As Damon (1973) 298 put it, Calpurnius' limited commitment to pastoral prompted the revision of Virgil's sylvan scene in the interest of his own more pragmatic themes.

Calpurnius was also at pains not to duplicate the earlier pastoral strategies, and he tried to strike out on his own. For instance, his *Ecl.* 2 is an amoebean contest, but one which dispenses entirely with the traditional motifs. The singers are at the outset announced to be equal (ll. 3–4), and the judge, Thyrsis, therefore refuses to accept stakes. Both singers love the same girl, Crotale, but without apparent rivalry, and in the end Thyrsis says their love as well as their song keeps them equal (ll. 99–100). There is a superficial similarity to Virgil's third eclogue, but there the ending is founded on incapacity to judge the difference, not the strong sense of concord. In short, there is no contest. Calpurnius' third pastoral is a lament for an absconded mistress, whose return however is hinted from the closing lines. Another initiative is seen in *Ecl.* 5: it is didactic in character (the management of sheep and goats throughout the year), and owes a fair bit to the third book of Virgil's *Georgics*, though it is often overlooked that Calpurnius carefully supplements his predecessor's instructions. *Ecl.* 6 seems to be going to turn into an amoebean match between two rustics, but the contestants spend so much time in berating each other (a traditional element) that the contest never starts (an amusing conceit).¹⁷ Finally *Ecl.* 7 is squarely

¹⁷ Effe and Binder (2001) 104–108 provide a crisp account of the original elements in this eclogue.

in the tradition of the 'epideictic' epigram describing a remarkable building; there is nothing at all like this in Virgil.

Virgil is Calpurnius' chief model, and it is with his poetry that he engages almost to the exclusion of the original Greek tradition. But there are some traces of a debt to Theocritus. Calpurnius' *Ecl.* 6.43 is said to derive from Theocritus' *Id.* 11.40. Hubbard (1998) 156, with n. 28, however, feels that claims for an engagement with his Greek precursor are exaggerated, and certainly Virgil is detectable in every poem.

We may now try to gauge the quality of the writing, since Calpurnius is manifestly a star of less than the first magnitude. Horsfall (1997) 186 draws attention to his marked talent for elegant variation upon classical models, which gives an appearance of striking novelty and inventiveness. It is fair to say that he eschews the sort of direct quotation we find in Nemesianus; Calpurnius is not so lacklustre as that. At *Ecl.* 4.149–151 Meliboeus praises the pastoral song of Corydon as sweeter than the honey of Paelignian bees, a clear allusion to Ovid, who was born at Sulmo in Paelignian territory. Indeed, Calpurnius' style is Ovidian in its smoothness,¹⁸ a smoothness produced by a virtual absence of elision (scarcely a dozen instances). Calpurnius also favours arrangement of words in the so-called 'golden' line (e.g. *Ecl.* 1.7, 15, 18, etc.), a practice taken to wearisome length by his contemporary Lucan.

But we should also note the occasional lapse of the heedless imitator. At *Ecl.* 1.21 Ornytus says that the poem incised into the bark of the beech tree was done by someone unknown *properanti falce*, "with a hasty sickle". This seems odd at once, since a sickle is hardly the right shape for carving letters into a tree. It becomes odder still when we find that the poem is fifty-five lines long; haste is out of the question! What has happened is that Calpurnius has remembered a phrase from Propertius, 4.2.59, in which the god Vertumnus recalls that he was once a maple stump, "by hurried sickle hewn" (*properanti falce dolutus*), an expression quite apt to describe a roughly blocked out figure. Our poet liked the phrase (or couldn't be bothered to come up with a more appropriate one), and stuck it into his pastoral. One sees the motive: Vertumnus is a god of gardens and so has something to do with the life of the countryside. He describes himself in terms which might therefore be transferable to a pastoral. Only the chosen context is not

¹⁸ Fey-Wickert (2002) 29–31 provides details for the second and third eclogues.

after all satisfactory (but Ovid has at least a name carved in the bark by a *falx* at *Her.* 5.22). Similarly at *Ecl.* 4.32 “I soothed my hunger with green hibiscus (*viridi ... hibisco*)” he picks up *viridi ... hibisco* from *Ecl.* 2.30 (where it probably means “to the green hibiscus”), but it is not an item of human diet, however reduced one’s circumstances (cf. Pliny, *NH* 19.89 *damnatum in cibis*, “condemned as foodstuff”). Again it is a case of an ill-thought out borrowing. Another such borrowing is perhaps seen at *Ecl.* 7.27 *inter femineas ... cathedras*, “among the women’s seats”, which may be owed to Horace, *Sat.* 1.10.91 *discipularum inter ... cathedras*, “amid his pupils’ seats”; in fact the men who could not afford clean togas, the *pullati*, did not sit among the women, but in the section below them.

In attempting an overall assessment of Calpurnius we may note two deficiencies. The first is the lack of pathos. Many of Virgil’s bucolic poems are suffused with a sense of loss or yearning or absence (never, to be sure, so emphasized as to swamp the delicate ethos of the genre), but this note is wholly absent from Calpurnius, except in the last poem, where Corydon yearns to stay in Rome, an emotion not quite as affecting as that of a man who has lost his farm or his lover. Secondly, in Calpurnius’ hands pastoral is clearly treated as a genre, with its appropriate code; we see this especially in his reluctance to admit any Roman names to his poems, a curious feature of Virgil’s *Eclogues*. He is good at remodelling the generic code (recall the ‘didactic’ fourth poem, or the singing match of the sixth that never gets under way because the contestants spend so much time abusing each other), but the changes serve no wider purpose. It is not as if he had anything particular to say that required them. Rather change is introduced for the sake of creating difference, a purely generic experiment. To put that another way, Virgil’s achievement is always in view, and Calpurnius seems content to have sounded his own note (in the non-panegyric poems) by doing what Virgil didn’t.

2. *Einsiedeln Eclogues*

The contemporary *Einsiedeln Eclogues* deserve a word here.¹⁹ No author’s name attaches to these poems (the first of which seems to be fragmentary). We cannot be sure that they are composed by the same writer;

¹⁹ Hubbard (1998) 140–150 and Effe and Binder (2001) 114–123 provide modern assessment, with ample bibliography.

and as with Calpurnius, their date too is contested (Courtney (1987) 156–157 dates the second after Calpurnius, that is to say, after Statius). Their themes however are straightforward enough. The first praises the emperor as a lyre-player, and it seems even to allude to his poem on the fall of Troy (38–41). This would place it rather late in the reign, after Nero (assuming a Neronian date) had more openly avowed his enthusiasm for singing. The praises of Nero's performance, and presumably of his composing as well, are fulsome, a characteristic of the age noted by Dewar (1994) 205–206: Nero outdoes Virgil, symbolized by Mantua, his birthplace, which is tearing up his books (ll. 48–49)! The very short second eclogue announces that the return of the Golden Age is now a certainty (21–22); imitations of Virgil's *Ecl.* 4 are rife. Its date therefore fits better with the beginning of the reign, when the Golden Age commonplace was natural. A curious technical feature of this second poem deserves note: the first six lines of dialogue are not divided between the speakers in whole lines (the usual practice), but they start or stop speaking within the hexameter line. The most that critics find to say in favour of these poems is that they confirm the use of pastoral for imperial panegyric. Quality apart, there is a lively debate about the tone, especially of the second poem. Either or both poems are felt to be subtly critical of the emperor, and of his propaganda, an interpretation advanced by Korzeniewski (1966), and Sullivan (1985) 56–58; recently Merfeld (1999) has argued elaborately for their irony, not without the approval of Dewar (2003).

3. *Marcus Aurelius Olympius Nemesianus*

The last pastoral poet of pagan antiquity is Nemesianus.²⁰ In addition to his four eclogues, he wrote a (partly extant) didactic poem on hunting, the *Cynegetica*, dedicated to the princes Numerianus and Carinus (283–284 AD). His four pastorals were long, but erroneously, parceled up with the seven that belong to Calpurnius. In fact the oldest mss. did ascribe these four to Nemesianus, but copies of them, from which our earliest printed editions derived, made the mistake of omitting his

²⁰ Hubbard (1998) 178–212 offers a particularly sympathetic reading of his poems, but he is uncritical of his magpie thefts from earlier writers. See also Effe and Binder (2001) 126–141. For extensive bibliographical matter see Herzog and Schmidt (1989) 309–312, to which may be added Walter (1988) and Green (1990).

authorship. Haupt (1875) sorted out the attribution; Reeve (1986) 37–38 provides the best discussion of the transmission.

Before turning to the poems themselves it should be stressed that in resurrecting bucolic Nemesianus at once marks himself out as a neo-classicist (a description of him owed to the able essay by Schetter (1973)). Nemesianus began his literary career in the late 3rd century at a low ebb in the state of Latin literature. He had the independence to repudiate the standards of the *poesis novella*, a mid-2nd-cent. movement finely described, e.g., by von Albrecht (1997) vol. 2, 1317–1320, and he returned to the forms—didactic and bucolic—of the classic period (Augustan and post-Augustan). Little wonder then that Nemesianus borrows so extensively from Virgil and Calpurnius; such indebtedness is part of his programme, and not necessarily a sign of inferior invention. Let us now turn briefly to the poems.

In *Ecl.* 1 Thymoetas asks Tityrus for a song, but he declines on grounds of age, and induces Thymoetas instead to sing his recently composed dirge in honour of Meliboeus. In *Ecl.* 2 two disappointed lovers of the same girl, Donace, chide her for not showing more enterprise in eluding her parents. In *Ecl.* 3 two boys surprise Pan during his siesta, and he obliges them with a song in praise of Bacchus (a novelty in bucolic). In the last eclogue, two unhappy lovers complain of the cruelty of their beloveds, one male, the other female.

From these brief outlines, thematic debts to earlier bucolic spring at once to view. The first of Nemesianus' poems owes something to Virgil's *Ecl.* 5, and the third evokes both the setting of Virgil's *Ecl.* 6 and the context (Pan's loss of his pipes) of an anonymous Greek poem.²¹ But we see too how Nemesianus marks out new territory for bucolic song within the traditional frameworks. The Meliboeus of his first poem, for instance, is nobody special, unlike Virgil's Daphnis, and he is certainly not a ruler. He seems rather to be a good man of private station, cast in the role of a rural benefactor and judge (see Effe and Binder (2001) 132–135). Nemesianus rightly here dispenses with traditional panegyric, and paints instead a picture of rural harmony centred on the dead man's memory. It has been fairly pointed out by Himmelmann-Wildschütz (1972) that this mirrors the sorts of bucolic scenes found on contemporary sarcophagi; the role of these pastoral images (the "exemplum bucolicum") for the consolation of the living is

²¹ This is the *carmen bucolicum Vindobonense*, edited with a commentary by Bernsdorff (1999). For Nemesianus' alleged debt to Theocritus see Castagna (1970).

further pursued by Koortbojian (1995) 78–84. Nemesianus is therefore seen to be engaging with contemporary eschatological concerns. He is at any rate not simply reshuffling the deck of inherited pastoral motifs. It is also typical of his agenda that in these two poems particularly (*Ecl.* 1 and 3) he adopts situations which Calpurnius had not taken up.

So Nemesianus is not without personal resource. Far from it: his first eclogue opens with Tityrus weaving a rush basket, the very image of the bucolic singer with which Virgil had closed his own collection (*Ecl.* 10.71). This scene is pregnant with meaning: Tityrus, who has been asked for a song, declines, and urges the younger Thymoetas to sing instead. Now Tityrus was often in antiquity taken to be the bucolic name for Virgil (for instance, by Martial, 8.55(56).8); so when the aged Tityrus here announces his retirement, and a younger shepherd sings, we are clearly presented with an image of the pastoral tradition at work: Nemesianus picks up where Virgil left off. His second eclogue begins with the word *formasam*, “beautiful”, evoking the opening word of Virgil’s second eclogue. The innovative frame of the third eclogue has been analysed by Lackner (1996). We detect overall a certain playfulness in his engagement with his model. But for all that, Nemesianus’ skill is not unlike that of the builders of Constantine’s arch. Just as they recycled sculptural elements from earlier monuments, often without the slightest attempt made to accommodate them to their new context, so Nemesianus lifts whole lines of verse from his predecessors,²² especially Calpurnius, and sets them into incongruous milieus (and it is the incongruity, not the borrowing, which is the artistic fault).

Both Calpurnius and Nemesianus helped to transmit the pastoral mode to the Middle Ages and beyond; their poems were read, admired, and imitated. Herzog and Schmidt (1989) 314–315 provide a full account for Nemesianus’ influence on later bucolic. As Reeve (1986) 37 noted, Calpurnius and Nemesianus reappeared in Italy at a time propitious to pastoral: a manuscript at Verona came to the notice of Petrarch about 1360, after the composition of his own *Bucolicum carmen* but not too late to influence Boccaccio’s. It is important to bear in mind that for many later European pastoral poets Virgil was only one, albeit the most admired, available model. The lesser lights had something to contribute as well. Fortunately, their talents are nowadays receiving a fairer assessment.

²² For the Virgilian *furta* in particular see Volpilhac (1987).

BUCOLIC TRADITION
AND POETIC PROGRAMME
IN CALPURNIUS SICULUS

ENRICO MAGNELLI

My objective is not to create a comprehensive literary portrait of Calpurnius,¹ but to specifically draw attention to the link between Calpurnius' poetics and his idea of bucolic genre. Much has been written concerning the features of his pastoral world and the extent of his debts to, and deviations from, the Virgilian model; nevertheless, I believe that a reevaluation of the evidence may lead to a better understanding of the poet's aims in his long walk along Virgil's path.

Well known is Calpurnius' wide range of topics, far wider than in Virgil's *Eclogues*. In *Ecl.* 2, Calpurnius puts on stage a gardener, alien to the pastoral world, who describes his trade employing several borrowings from the *Georgics*;² *Georgics* is the model for *Ecl.* 5, consisting in old Micon's detailed teachings to his young son Canthus on stock-breeding;³ in *Ecl.* 3 we find a jealousy scene imported from Theocritus' *Id.* 14;⁴ *Ecl.* 7 relates the spectacles offered by the emperor to the people of Rome, Calpurnius probably looking at Theocritus' *Id.* 15 (the *Συραχόσαι*).⁵ So great a variety of non-pastoral themes led scholars to say that by Nero's age "the boundaries of the bucolic genre are utterly undermined".⁶ This may well be true, but such an undermining did not take place at random, nor was it due to mere experimentalism. As a matter of fact, Calpurnius' main sources are to be found inside the bucolic tradition. He displays a good deal of borrowings and inter-textual links with other authors and genres (Lucretius, the Augustan elegists, Horace, mostly Ovid); but as far as structure and plot are concerned, his models—except in *Ecl.* 3, which interweaves Virgilian and

¹ For which see Mayer's contribution to this volume, pp. 451ff.

² See Vinchesi (1996) 35f. and Fey-Wickert (2002) 16–22.

³ Amat (1991) 45; Vinchesi (1996) 39–40. See also below, n. 34.

⁴ Verdière (1966) 169; Leach (1975) 213.

⁵ Amat (1991) xxxi.

⁶ Perutelli (1976) 782, still a pivotal study on the evolution of Roman bucolic poetry.

Theocritean motifs with several themes from erotic elegy⁷—are none but his two major forerunners in the field of pastoral poetry, namely Theocritus and Virgil.

The first feature we must focus on is that non-bucolic elements are constantly ‘bucolicised’, i.e. integrated into a wholly bucolic context.⁸ Thus in *Ecl.* 3 the plot of Theocritus’ *Id.* 14 (young Thyonichus’ unhappy love for the courtesan Cynisca, both city-dwellers⁹) is transferred into the pastoral world of characters named Iollas, Lycidas, Phyllis; and the spectacles of *Ecl.* 7 are not seen through the eyes of a townspeople like Theocritus’ Syracusan women, but through those of the herdsman Corydon, fashioned in a way reminiscent of Virgilian Tityrus.¹⁰ The same happens with Virgil. Faunus’ prophecy in Calpurnius’ *Ecl.* 1, modelled as it may be on the prophecy uttered by the same god on Latinus’ request at *Aen.* 7.96–101,¹¹ is no longer addressed to a king: Faunus is speaking to shepherds, “my folk” (36–37: *vos o praecipue nemorum gaudete coloni, / vos populi gaudete mei*, “rejoice above all, ye denizens of the woods; rejoice, ye peoples who are mine!”), in a proper pastoral environment.¹² *Ecl.* 5 owes much to *Georgics*, but it concentrates on stock-breeding alone, leaving out agriculture, and the closure, with the advice “let’s come back, it’s getting dark” (ll. 120–121), is that of several Virgilian *Eclogues* (see below). In *Ecl.* 2 the gardener, as we remarked above, has nothing to do with the bucolic world. Nonetheless he competes with a shepherd in a typically pastoral contest, singing an amoebean song in the presence of other shepherds and of a judge named Thyrsis. With regard to variety, Calpurnius is undeniably closer to Theocritus (“cette variété est celle des *Idylles* de Théocrite plus que de Virgile”, as Jacqueline Amat rightly pointed out);¹³ in many details he deliberately overrides the generic code as it had been established

⁷ See Leach (1975) 214–216, Davis (1987) 35, and the detailed analysis by Vinchesi (1991).

⁸ This was rightly, albeit very briefly, stated by von Albrecht (1997) vol. 2, 992: “Calpurnius ... enlarges the bucolic genre, without, however, breaking up its limits”.

⁹ Though some details in their story may recall the bucolic tradition: see Pretagostini, this volume, pp. 67–70.

¹⁰ Cf. e.g. Di Salvo (1990) 42 and the detailed study of Küppers (1989) 37–44; but the similarity is a well known one.

¹¹ As already remarked by many scholars. Martin (1996) 21 also mentions Faunus’ teachings to king Numa in Ovid, *Fast.* 4.649–670: but there no prophecy is at stake, and the link with Calpurnius seems to be very weak.

¹² See Vinchesi (1996) 14; other valuable suggestions can be found in Slater (1994).

¹³ Amat (1991) xxxvi; cf. also Esposito (1996) 29. For a slightly different point of view, see Perutelli (1976) 781 and 788. It’s hard to follow Hubbard (1996) 72 n. 19 = (1998)

after Virgil's *Eclogues*, or even reverses Virgilian themes and images.¹⁴ Yet the consistency of the pastoral frame is Virgil's, or even stronger than Virgil's. Among Virgilian *Eclogues*, in poem 4 at least the bucolic elements remain quite marginal—an invocation of the *Sicelides Musae* in the first line, a brief mention of Pan and Arcadia at ll. 58–59 and the vaguely 'rural' flavour of the Golden Age landscape. Calpurnius, on the contrary, admits no exception to the rule: he allows himself many innovations, but makes clear to the reader that his poetry is bucolic poetry anyway.

Did Calpurnius mean to combine, in his short bucolic *libellus*, two important features of his two renowned literary ancestors, i.e. Theocritean variety and Virgilian consistency? Perhaps, but I think there is more. In transposing non-bucolic Theocritean motifs into a bucolic context, Calpurnius' model was once again Virgil, who in *Ecl.* 8.64–109 had rewritten Theocritus' *Id.* 2, the *Φαρμακέντρου*, giving it both a pastoral environment (the characters are no longer named Simaetha, Thestylis, Delphis, but Daphnis, Moeris, Amaryllis) and a pastoral frame (Alphesiboeus' song).¹⁵ This detail is usually overlooked in scholarly work on Calpurnius, yet I think that it is perfectly relevant. On one hand, Calpurnius imitates this Virgilian device in *Ecl.* 3 and 7; on the other hand, he applies it to Virgil himself, transferring in the pastoral world of *Ecl.* 1, 2 and 5 elements from the *Aeneid* or the *Georgics*. Imitation becomes emulation: our author identifies an important feature of Virgil's literary technique, uses it systematically (stressing that he is able to do what his great forebear did) and applies it to his very model (thus reshaping Virgil's work in the same way Virgil had reshaped Theocritus'). Far from destroying tradition, innovation faces it under the sign of competition and continuity—a continuity in terms of poetics and poetical devices rather than topics.

Calpurnius' high consideration of his own status as a bucolic poet is plainly seen in his literary self-portrait. Most scholars agree that the shepherd Corydon, protagonist of the three 'political' *Eclogues* (1, 4, 7),

156 n. 28 when he writes that "at no point is Theocritus a direct source for anything in Calpurnius".

¹⁴ Such features are carefully examined by Damon (1973) 291–298, Davis (1987), and now by R. Mayer in his contribution to this volume (above, pp. 459–462).

¹⁵ The first line of this *Eclogue* is revealing: *Pastorum Musam Damonis et Alphesiboei*: "Pastorum, as if to assert the pastoral character of the poem as a whole in anticipation of the reader's response to the unpastoral Muse of Alphesiboeus" (Clausen (1994) *ad loc.*); properly unpastoral was the Theocritean model.

must represent the author himself:¹⁶ he praises the emperor in *Ecl.* 7, he regrets the poverty of poets in *Ecl.* 4.58–72, wishes brighter days under the new ruler, and, above all, establishes his own relationship with literary tradition:

CO. *quod si tu faveas trepido mihi, forsitan illos
experiar calamos, here quos mihi doctus Iollas
donavit dixitque: "truces haec fistula tauros
conciliat nostroque sonat dulcissima Fauno.*

*Tityrus hanc habuit, cecinit qui primus in istis
montibus Hyblaea modulabile carmen avena".*

ME. *magna petis, Corydon, si Tityrus esse laboras.*

*ille fuit vates sacer et qui posset avena
praesonuisse chelyn, blandae cui saepe canenti
adludere ferae, cui substitit advena quercus,
quem modo cantantem rutilo spargebat acantho
Nais et implicitos comebat pectine crines.*

CO. *est, fateor, Meliboeus, deus: sed nec mihi Phoebus
forsitan abnuerit. tu tantum commodus audi:
scimus enim, quam te non aspernetur Apollo.*

(Corydon) But if you would show favour to my nervous attempts, perhaps I might make trial of those reeds which skilful Iollas presented to me yesterday with the words, "This pipe wins over savage bulls, and makes sweetest melody to our own Faunus. It once was owned by Tityrus, who among these hills of yours was the first to sing his tuneful lay on the Hyblaeon pipe".

(Meliboeus) You aim high, Corydon, if you strive to be Tityrus. He was a bard inspired, one who could on the reed-pipe outplay the lyre. Often, while he sang, beasts of the wild fawned in frolic near, and the oak came close and halted there: did he but sing, a Naiad would adorn him with red acanthus and dress with a comb his tangled locks.

(Co.) He is, I own, a poet divine, Meliboeus, but mayhap Phoebus will not say me nay either: do you but favourably hear me; for we know how far Apollo is from slighting you.

The literature on *Ecl.* 4 is extensive, and this is not the right place to address all the scholarly disputes this passage has provoked.¹⁷ Anyway, it is clear that Tityrus represents Virgil, the author of the *Eclogues*; Corydon-Calpurnius, speaking to his patron and literary judge Meliboeus (whom scholars tried to identify with Seneca or with other influ-

¹⁶ Davis (1987) 39—developing the doubts of Leach (1973) 86—and Newlands (1987) 227–229 are perhaps the most notable exceptions.

¹⁷ See Schröder (1991) 21–29 and 119–131.

ential men of his age¹⁸), does not hesitate to acknowledge Virgil's excellence, meanwhile introducing himself as his poetical heir. But why Corydon? In Virgil's work, Corydon is the speaker of the long erotic monologue of *Ecl.* 2: *rusticus es, Corydon*, the shepherd says to himself (l. 56), and the same *rusticitas* is plainly admitted by the Calpurnian character, in both his look (7.79: *o utinam nobis non rustica vestis inestet!*, "O would that I had not been clad in peasant garb!") and his poetry (4.14–15: *nunc mea rusticitas, si non valet arte polita / carminis, at certe valeat pietate probari*, "yet, as things are, my awkwardness, even if lacking in poetry's polish and skill, must surely win approval for its loyalty"). Eleanor Leach, with her reading of the 'political' *Eclogues* as an expression of the poet's disillusion and of his criticism of imperial power,¹⁹ assumes that Corydon was chosen because of his apparent naivety. Like other scholars,²⁰ I cannot agree with her opinion, but I prefer to emphasize that Virgil's Corydon is not just the *rusticus* of *Ecl.* 2. He is also the renowned singer of *Ecl.* 7, as Meliboeus (a name that Calpurnius will assign to his patron, as we have seen above), witness of his contest with Thyrsis, states in the final couplet (7.69–70):

*haec memini, et victum frustra contendere Thyrsin.
ex illo Corydon Corydon est tempore nobis.*²¹

So much I remember, and how Thyrsis strove in vain against defeat.
From that day Corydon is the one and only Corydon for us.

The interpretation of Corydon as an allegory of its author is well attested in Virgilian scholarship of the Late Antiquity. We don't know whether it already existed by Calpurnius' time, as Volker Langholf

¹⁸ The most detailed surveys of the many hypotheses (some of them quite odd) are offered by Spadaro (1969) 27–28 n. 49, Verdière (1977), and Schröder (1991) 29–34.

¹⁹ Leach (1973) 85–87. Her approach, further developed in Leach (1975), is accepted among others by Davis (1987) and, to some extent, Vozza (1993) and Martin (2003) 87–90.

²⁰ E.g. Vinchesi (1996) 27 with n. 39 and Fear (1994); see also Mayer's contribution to this volume (above, pp. 457–458).

²¹ The line is all the more telling when the reader acknowledges its model, i.e. [Theocr.] 8.92 *κῆρ τούτω πρῶτος παρὰ ποιέεισι Δάφνης ἔγεντο*, "and from that day was Daphnis first among the herdsmen": Corydon is praised in the same way the ps.-Theocritus of *Id.* 8 praises Daphnis, the mythical creator of pastoral poetry. I am not persuaded by Hubbard (1996) 71 = (1998) 154 when he argues that Calpurnius employs the Virgilian model in order to depict Corydon as an "unstable ephebe poet, yearning for recognition, but uncertain of himself". Corydon's exhibited fear has nothing to do with his own poetic skill: it rather concerns his financial difficulties.

argued in his ground-breaking study;²² but we can confidently say that Virgil's *Ecl.* 7 had contributed no less than *Ecl.* 2 to Calpurnius' choosing of this very mask. Calpurnius-Corydon does not claim to be a *vates sacer* (*Ecl.* 4.65), something of a *deus* (4.70) like Virgil, yet, within the narrow space of his *rusticitas*, i.e. of bucolic poetry,²³ he does not hesitate to assert his skill and to set himself as the next-of-kin of his great literary ancestor.²⁴

The importance of the bucolic genre is probably reasserted in another passage of Calpurnius' poetry book. In *Ecl.* 2, Idas the shepherd and Astacus the gardener start their amoebean song recalling their 'professional' consecration by the proper tutelary gods (2.28–35):

*ID. me Silvanus amat, dociles mihi donat avenas
et mea frondenti circumdat tempora taeda.
ille etiam parvo dixit mihi non leve carmen:
"iam levis obliqua crescat tibi fistula canna".*

*AS. et mihi Flora comas pallenti gramine pingit
et matura mihi Pomona sub arbore ludit.
"accipe", dixerunt Nymphae, "puer, accipe fontes:
iam potes irriguos nutrire canalibus hortos".*²⁵

(Idas) I am loved of Silvanus—he gives me reeds to obey my will—he wreathes my temples with leaves of pine. To me while yet a boy he uttered this prophecy of no slender import: "May upon the sloping reed a slender pipe grow for thee".

(Astacus) And my locks doth Flora adorn with pale-green grasses, and for me Pomona in her ripeness sports beneath the tree. "Take, boy", said the Nymphs, "take for yourself these fountains. Now with the channels you can feed your well-watered orchard".

Many images and words in this passage seem to conceal a poetological meaning. Peter J. Davis remarks *en passant* that "the vocabulary chosen by Astacus is suggestive of song", mentioning the *fons* of the mountain of the Muses and the *canales* of Corydon's panpipe in Calpurnius' *Ecl.* 4

²² Langholf (1990) 357 with n. 23.

²³ Vinchesi (1996) 29 aptly remarks that the word seems to refer not just to Corydon's living conditions, but to the pastoral song itself. Cf. also Correa (1977) 152.

²⁴ In Virgil's poetry book, Tityrus is the protagonist of *Ecl.* 1, Corydon of *Ecl.* 2. Did Calpurnius also intend to lead his audience to a chronological reading of such a sequence, Tityrus-Virgil at the beginning of Latin pastoral tradition and Corydon-Calpurnius, his heir and follower, in the second place? This, however, is nothing more than mere hypothesis.

²⁵ On the major textual problems of these lines (the variant readings *crescit* at 31 and *at* in the next line; the transmitted *parienti* against de Rooy's *pallenti* at 32) see Fey-Wickert (2002) 82–83.

(76–77: *canales / et preme, qui dignas cecinerunt consule silvas*, “press the pipes which sang of woods worthy of a consul”).²⁶ I would think of two passages from Virgil’s *Eclogues*: 3.111 *claudite iam rivos, pueri: sat prata biberunt*, “shut off the springs now, lads; the meadows have drunk enough”, where the poetological metaphor is most clear, and 6.69 *hos tibi dant calamos, en accipe, Musae*, “these reeds—see, take them—the Muses give you”, probably imitated by Calpurnius at 2.34 (from the consecration of Gallus, *divinus poeta*, by Linus and the Muses to the consecration of Astacus, poet and gardener, by the humble Nymphs, traditional bucolic goddesses²⁷). Anyway, this remains partly speculative. Less speculative, however, is the metaphorical use of *levis* at l. 31. It is well true that in the field of classical studies the search for poetological meanings and allusions has often been pushed too far, all the more when *levis*, λεπτός and other words traditionally linked with Callimachean poetics are involved,²⁸ but here it’s hard to imagine that Calpurnius, remembering both Virgil’s *deductum carmen*, “lay fine-spun” (*Ecl.* 6.5), and the *leve carmen* of the god Pan in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, 11.154, is not referring to style.²⁹ Thus the clear opposition between *levis* and the *non leve carmen* of the previous line, far from being just a word-play,³⁰ also has a very definite meaning: this *carmen* (a purportedly ambiguous word, referring to Silvanus’ ‘prophetic verse’ but also suitable for an allusion to poetry) “was not irrelevant” not only because it was uttered by a god but also because it relates to a literary genre whose dignity was fully established by the poet’s time. In Calpurnius’ view, bucolic poetry may be *levis* with regard to style, but its relevance is not *levis* at all.

²⁶ Davis (1987) 52 n. 19.

²⁷ Replacement of the Muses with the Nymphs as patrons of pastoral song, and in a wider sense, selection of a specialized bucolic *pantheon*, are devices already exploited by Theocritus: see Fantuzzi (2000) and Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 147–148, 151–156.

²⁸ In the field of Latin studies one might recall the witty remarks by Barchiesi (1997b) 672: “dopo tutto quello che si è scritto in anni recenti sul callimachismo autoriflesso della poesia romana, è da prevedere un certo effetto di saturazione: qualcuno vorrà certo proporre una sospensiva, almeno temporanea, di studi su ‘magro’ e ‘grasso’, gigantomachie, navicelle e fiumi in piena” (at the same time warning that “una reazione diametrica, oltre che ingenerosa, sarebbe dannosa: c’è il rischio di gettar via il bambino insieme all’acqua sporca dell’Eufrate”).

²⁹ Aptly pointed out by Stanzel (1989) 190 with n. 17 (“wenn Silvanus die *fistula levis* nennt, dann liegt darin neben dem Gegensatz zu *non leve carmen* eine Stilbestimmung der Bukolik”); cf. now also Fey-Wickert (2002) *ad loc.*

³⁰ Such was the opinion of Verdière (1954) *ad loc.*: “C. eût pu, par respect pour le dieu, mettre un peu moins d’humour à écrire *non leve carmen—levis ... fistula*”.

Calpurnius' 'specialization' as a bucolic poet and his eagerness to stress the importance of the pastoral genre may help us to understand *Ecl.* 5, whose general meaning might seem unclear. The beginning (ll. 1–4),

*forte Micon senior Canthusque, Miconis alumnus,
torrentem patula vitabant ilice solem,
cum iuveni senior praecepta daturus alumno
talìa verba refert, eqs.*

It fell out that the aged Micon and Canthus, Micon's son, were seeking shelter from the blazing sun beneath a spreading holm-oak, when to give counsel to his son the old man uttered these words, etc.

picks up that of Virgil's *Ecl.* 7 (7.1 *forte sub arguta consederat ilice Daphnis*); Micon's name is well established in pastoral tradition (Theocr. 5.112; Virgil, *Ecl.* 3.10 and 7.30); the closure (ll. 119–121),

*plura quidem meminisse velim, nam plura supersunt:
sed iam sera dies cadit et iam sole fugato
frigidus aëstivas compellit Noctifer horas.*

Fain would I recall more precepts; for more remain. But now the late day falls; and, now that the sun is put to flight, the chill Night-Bringer drives forth the summer hours.

is typically bucolic (cf. Virgil, *Ecl.* 1.82–83: *et iam summa procul villarum culmina fumant / maioresque cadunt altis de montibus umbrae*, "even now the housetops yonder are smoking and longer shadows fall from the mountain heights"; 6.85–86: *cogere donec ovis stabulis numerumque referre / iussit et invito processit Vesper Olympo*, "till Vesper gave the word to fold the flocks and tell their tale, as he set forth over an unwilling sky"; 10.75–77: *surgamus; solet esse gravis cantantibus umbra; / ... / ite domum saturae, venit Hesperus, ite capellae*, "let us arise. The shade is oft perilous to the singer; ... Get home, my full-fed goats, get home—the Evening Star draws on").³¹ Nonetheless, didactic style and plain imitation of the *Georgics* led some scholars to read Calpurnius' *Ecl.* 5 as "pause and innovation" in our poet's career, a first attempt to exploit another literary genre.³² To my mind, careful scrutiny of Calpurnius'

³¹ All of the relevant parallels and intertextual links have been long detected by the commentators.

³² This theory was championed by Marchiò (1957); the doubts of Verdière (1985) 1854f. are, in my view, very well grounded. Leach (1975) 217 is correct when stating that *Ecl.* 5 "can hardly be taken for a serious essay into didactic poetry"; but I would not share her pessimistic reading, according to which "this anxious recital shows the

poetics may suggest the reverse theory: the author is not trying to turn bucolic into georgic, rather to ‘bucolicise’ georgic, thus reasserting his allegiance to the genre³³ and absorbing didactic poetry into the context of his own pastoral world.³⁴ The ending seems most revealing for this: “many other precepts remain”, that is, “I could write a poem like the *Georgics*, but I prefer to keep my verse within the small size of the *Eclogues*, which requires that everything come to an end at sunset”.

It is worth stating that such ‘pastoralisation’ mainly works, in my view, on a literary level. Ideology is quite a different matter. The meaning of *Ecl.* 7 is much disputed: how are we to understand Corydon’s wish “O would that I had not been clad in peasant garb!” (l. 79, quoted above: *o utinam nobis non rustica vestis inesset!*) and his harsh reproach to aged Lycotas who prefers “to see old beech-trees rather than the new sights exhibited by our youthful god in the spacious arena” (ll. 5–6: *qui veteres fagos nova quam spectacula mavis / cernere, quae patula iuvenis deus edit harena*)? As stated above, I do not share Leach’s theory of Calpurnius’ political *Eclogues* as “a chronicle of disappointment” and of *Ecl.* 7 as the demonstration of how “Nero ... has created lavish perversion of nature” and “wealth and luxury, traditional enemies of the pastoral

herdsman’s life as a constant dedication of energy to making defenses against nature”, and “Mycon reveals a world where the prospects of youth lead only to weary old age” (Calpurnius’ focus on old Micon’s *verba ... tremulis titubantia labris* at l. 4 appears to be nothing but a touch of realism, in keeping with the poet’s taste and trends: cf. Di Lorenzo (1988) 19–20).

³³ Messina (1975) 106 aptly remarks that Calpurnius aims to give bucolic shape to the georgic precepts; but then he also, though less resolutely than Marchiò, inclines to read this poem as a departure from truly bucolic genre. I would rather think that appropriating foreign elements and adapting them to its own needs is just another way for the genre to reassert its vitality.

³⁴ Alfredo M. Morelli acutely points out to me that the section of the *Georgics* devoted to stock-breeding (sheep and goats, not cattle, as in Calpurnius) is introduced by Virgil in a most grand manner and with a claim to poetical originality in the Callimachean and Lucretian manner (3.286–294), in order to stress the novelty of this topic within the framework of the poem. Calpurnius, instead, seems to ‘take back’ this theme to its most natural context, namely the bucolic one. And here also Calpurnius might have had an eye on Virgil’s *Eclogues*. Morelli himself remarks—rightly, in my view—that Calpurnius’ final lines recall several Virgilian closures, but mostly that of *Ecl.* 6 (Calp. 119 *plura quidem meminisse velim, nam plura supersunt* ~ Virg. 86 *iussit et invito processit Vesper Olympo*): Silenus passes his knowledge on the two boys just like Micon does on Canthus, but Calpurnius’ old herdsman does not engage in his forebear’s high subject and keeps within the humble themes of pastoral life, thus somehow reworking Virgil through Virgil.

ideal, have corrupted the innocence of the simple herdsman".³⁵ However, one cannot deny that Corydon's statements suggest, in Leach's words, "his loss of the pastoral ideal".³⁶ Is this the outcome of ideological change, of an evolution in the poet's attitude? Is he finally unsatisfied with the bucolic world? On the contrary, I would say that Calpurnius never sketched a true 'pastoral ideal' in his poems; nowhere will the reader find him longing for Tityrus' quiet life or for Gallus' dream-like Arcadia. The world of herdsmen and bucolic singers is no longer a lost paradise. It's just a literary framework, to be carefully depicted and preserved in order to exhibit the author's poetical skill and to convey, when necessary, his encomiastic efforts—even if this requires an explicit rejection of proper pastoral ethics. Obviously this does not rule out the possibility that, from a literary point of view, *Ecl.* 7 is something of a farewell to bucolic poetry: as many scholars have already pointed out, at the end of the collection Calpurnius might implicitly tell his audience that he is turning to a different poetical genre.³⁷ But we know too little about him to be certain.

It's easy to understand the reasons for bucolic poetry's revival in the age of Nero (if one accepts Calpurnius' early chronology³⁸). Pastoral could gratify the dominant taste for 'escapist' literature,³⁹ and at the same time was perfectly fit for systematic development of encomiastic themes already attested in Theocritus and Virgil. This may account for Calpurnius' poetic programme: while specializing in bucolic poetry and reasserting its relevance and dignity, our author also strives to temper innovations by means of a careful maintenance of the pastoral frame, thus preserving the genre from any loss of identity. It is not just a proof of his knowledge of the processes operating inside the bucolic tradition: it's a real choice in poetics. I'm not god-like Virgil, states Calpurnius,

³⁵ Leach (1973) 85–87; see above, n. 19.

³⁶ Leach (1973) 3; see also Vinchesi (1996) 25–29. This and other questions arising from *Ecl.* 7 are well assessed in Effe and Binder (2001) 108–113.

³⁷ So, e.g., Friedrich (1976) 158; Vinchesi (1996) 29. A new reading is offered by Hubbard (1996) 87 = (1998) 177, according to whom "never really capable of displacing Tityrus/Virgil, Corydon/Calpurnius can address the anxiety of influence only by breaking the reed-pipe, denying the value of the generic tradition, and ultimately abandoning the poet's calling altogether ... the conclusion of Calpurnius' *Eclogues* book is profoundly negative in its self-estimation as a poetic achievement". The reader can see that my own opinion is quite different.

³⁸ I agree with Mayer's sensible arguments on this point (this volume, pp. 454–456); to his bibliography add now Ruggeri (2002).

³⁹ For a clear survey on this question see Perutelli (1976) 782–787.

nor am I trying to achieve all he achieved: I'm nothing but a bucolic poet. But within my small field, that of the 'lower' genre of bucolics, I have learnt how to exploit literary tradition and to use my forebear's tools in an even stricter way than his.⁴⁰ I'm a 'specialized' Virgil, and this suits me very well. *Nec te paeniteat pecoris*, beyond any doubt.⁴¹

⁴⁰ On this point I wholly agree with Verdière (1966) 165: "nous voyons Calpurnius talonner, cerner Virgile à la suite d'une marche d'approche dont les étapes sont évidentes pour nous, comme s'il voulait le vaincre sur le champ de bataille où le Mantouan semble s'être illustré en premier lieu".

⁴¹ A first, shorter version of this paper was delivered at the international workshop "La tradition dans la poésie latine. Sources, modèles et intertextualité" (Lille, September 20–21, 2004) and then published in Italian on *Dictynna* 1 (<http://www.univ-lille3.fr/portail/index.php?page=Dictynna>). I am grateful to Jacqueline Fabre-Serris and to all the participants in the workshop for their useful suggestions; many thanks are also due to Gianfranco Agosti, Andrea Cucchiarelli, Claudio De Stefani, Lucia Floridi, Alfredo M. Morelli and Maria-Pace Pieri, who read these pages and commented on them, and to Christine Noel and Joyce Wolfe for revising and correcting my English.

English translations of Calpurnius are from J.W. and A.M. Duff (1934) 207–285, adapted where necessary; those of Virgil from Fairclough and Gould (1999).

THE PASTORAL NOVEL AND THE BUCOLIC TRADITION

MASSIMO DI MARCO

1. Daphnis and Chloe: *a synthesis unique*

When Longus the Sophist composed *Daphnis and Chloe*, most likely in the second half of the 2nd century AD, the novel evidently participated in a genre whose essential characteristics appeared to be clearly defined, despite the absence of any explicit theoretical codification: two young people, having fallen in love with each other at first sight, are separated by destiny and become the protagonists of a nearly interminable series of adventures (journeys over land and sea, ambushes, pirates' attacks, kidnappings, shipwrecks, apparent death, etc.); they overcome every temptation and survive every attack, succeed in remaining chaste and faithful to each other and at last, after many wanderings, they are reunited and live happily ever after. Following this outline, the story develops through remarkable vicissitudes and variations of fortune; these transport the two lovers to exotic, faraway lands, bringing them into contact with an enormous number of characters, in a continuous series of *coups de théâtre*. It is difficult to imagine anything further removed from the limited, peaceful, and, on the whole, serene rural world of bucolic poetry, a world apparently separated from the town, above all in Theocritus, where the only real element of disturbance and tension is the passion of love; in the eyes of Longus' contemporaries, therefore, the genres of the novel and of bucolic poetry must have appeared strikingly divergent, if not incompatible. And yet, what Longus has attempted to do is blend these two genres that on the surface seem so different, thus giving rise, in *Daphnis and Chloe*, to the so-called "pastoral novel".¹

¹ Cf. Effe (1982) 65: "Resultat eines kühnen generischen Experiments". Similarly Zeitlin (1990) 419: "a bold and provocative experiment (both psychological and artistic)".

It is difficult to find, in the literature of preceding periods, any models which might have inspired this operation of ‘contamination’,² even if only in part. In the 3rd century BC, Sositheus had composed a satyric drama, *Daphnis or Lityerses*, in which Daphnis went in search of his beloved Thaleia, who had been kidnapped by pirates, and learned that she was being held prisoner at the court of Lityerses, the King of Phrygia. This king was lamentably famous for forcing his guests to accept his challenge to a corn-cutting competition and then, after he had beaten them, lopping off their heads; it was only the intervention of Heracles that secured the girl’s freedom. By means of a *Kreuzung der Gattungen* wholly in tune with the literary practice of his period, Sositheus included the most emblematic character of the bucolic world in a plot dealing with love and adventure; all this, however, took place within a burlesque framework, one in which the chorus of satyrs must have played a significant role. During the reign of Trajan, Dio of Prusa exalted in his *Euboicus* the frugal temperance of rustic life, in harmony with the ideals of the Cynics, and narrated the development of a chaste love story between a boy and a girl. This is a work which undoubtedly shares the sympathy for humble country folk displayed in the novel by Longus,³ though the two compositions would appear to be substantially different in structure, tone and purpose.

In fact, the synthesis created by Longus is unique in its kind. Of the two components—the bucolic aspect and that of the intrigue and adventure—it is clearly the former that prevails.⁴ The only elements of the novel that Longus exploits are certain details of the pattern of composition: the presentation of the two young people, their vicissitudes (which are limited here to a few brief episodes) and the final

² On Longus’ novel as the result of the contamination of different literary genres, cf. Pattoni (2004).

³ The town-country dialectic is one of the most important themes of *Daphnis and Chloe*. On the social reasons for idealisation of the countryside (seen by Longus, however, through the eyes of a town-dweller), cf. Longo (1978) and Effe (1982).

⁴ Bucolic elements in other novels are very scarce. An interesting case is the story of the Pan and Syrinx in Achilles Tat. 8.6, found also in Long. 2.34. But the tale about the origins of the pipe, which Achilles supplies with many details, is little more than an insert in the frame of his work and belongs to its peculiar “encyclopedic tendency”: see Fusillo (1989) 17–109. Noteworthy is also the fable of Rhodopis and Euthynicus (Achilles Tat. 8.12), which in many ways recalls the Theocritean story of Daphnis. A papyrus fragment of the 3rd century AD (*PSI* 1220 = *AGNF* pp. 429–437) preserves a fictional narrative in which characters are given bucolic names “of Dionysiac colouring” (so Hunter (1983a) 17): Staphylus, “grape”; Ampeloi, “vines”; Dryas, “oak”, like Chloe’s adopted father. It looks like a short story, however, rather than a full-length novel.

recognition of their true identity and social conditions. On the contrary, all the rest—the scenery, the characters, their daily actions, the details of their way of life—contains constant references to the world of shepherds, as it is illustrated mainly in Theocritus' bucolic idylls. The numerous expressions taken from the bucolic corpus, together with the obstinate insistence with which the key word ποιμενικός qualifies objects and actions in the novel,⁵ are such as to provide ample justification for the opinion expressed by Georg Rohde: "Longus will nicht minder Bukoliker als Erotiker sein".⁶

2. *What is the remedy for lovesickness?*

However, Longus is no slavish imitator of Theocritus.⁷ The novel does teem with echoes of Theocritus, but Longus' adherence to his model is in no way mechanical. His constant attempt to introduce even minimal variations shows that Longus is eager to be compared with the previous tradition, and to adapt its peculiar motifs to the framework of his story. In practice, a general rewriting was inevitable, at least on the formal level: it is sufficient to think, e.g., of the need to convert the highly poetic quality of Theocritus' images and scenes to the rhythms of a prose narrative, or to adapt the mimic elements typical of bucolic idylls to the conventions of the narrative/diegetic code.⁸

It is important to emphasize the *imitatio-aemulatio* element of this work of 'rewriting', in which memory of the bucolic corpus, and of Theocritus in particular, is repeatedly evident in the form of conscious, deliberate allusion, much like a palimpsest that still reveals traces of

⁵ Cf. 1.3.2 and 1.6.3 (ὄνομα, "name"); 1.10.2 (ἀθύρματα ... ποιμενικά καὶ παιδικά, "sports of children and of shepherds"); 1.21.5 (παιδιάν, "prank"); 2.28.3 (σύριγγος ἦχος, "sound of the pipe"); 2.31.3 (ποιμενικὸν ἀνάθημα ποιμενικῷ θεῷ, "pastoral offering for a pastoral god"); 3.19.1 (γνώμην, "opinion"); 4.26.2 (κτήματα, "possessions"); 4.37.1 (γάμους, "wedding"); 4.39.1 τὸν πλεῖστον χρόνον ποιμενικὸν εἶχον, "for the most part of their time they held on to the pastoral mode".

⁶ Rohde (1937) 26.

⁷ Cf., among others, Rohde (1937), Mittelstadt (1966), Cresci (1981), Hunter (1983a).

⁸ On these two aspects, besides the perceptive observations of Rohde (1937) 29–33, see also Cozzoli (2000) 304–310. More in general, with reference to the literary allusions, cf. Alpers (1996) 325–326: "though the book can be represented in terms of plot, it is more accurately described as a series of set pieces ... Indeed, one can think of the book as a continual narrativizing of lyric".

its previous text. The high incidence of this practice demonstrates that Longus' intent was to perpetuate, albeit in different forms, a tradition of which Theocritus must, quite rightly, have appeared to him to be the leading representative.

If this is true, then it is even more surprising to find, in one of the most important scenes of the novel, a note of clearly expressed differentiation regarding a subject which plays a central role in the pastoral world of Theocritus, and one which lies much at the basis of the construction of the bucolic idyll: I am referring to the concept of love, and the relationship of shepherds to it. This divergence can be observed in the speech of old Philetas, shortly after the beginning of the second book (Long. 2.7.7):

Ἐρωτος γὰρ οὐδὲν φάρμακον, οὐ πινόμενον, οὐκ ἐσθιόμενον, οὐκ ἐν ᾧδαῖς
λαλούμενον, ὅτι μὴ φίλημα καὶ περιβολὴ καὶ συγκατακλιθῆναι γυμνοῖς
σώμασι.

For there is no medicine against Eros, no philtre, or tablet, or song, but only a kiss, an embrace, and lying together naked.⁹

The 'correction' of Theocr. 11.1–3 is plain to see:

Οὐδὲν ποττὸν ἔρωτα πεφύκει φάρμακον ἄλλο,
Νικία, οὐτ' ἔγχριστον, ἐμὴν δοκεῖ, οὐτ' ἐπίπαστον,
ἢ τὰι Πιερίδες.

It seems to me, o Nicias, that there is no other medicine, or ointment, or powder against love than the Pierides.

This is a correction that is decidedly important for the general structure of Longus' novel: when we consider the way in which he develops the story about Daphnis and Chloe, it becomes clear that, unlike Theocritus, Longus intends to deny not only the value of singing

⁹ The phrase φάρμακον ... ἐν ᾧδαῖς λαλούμενον, literally: "remedy consisting in the performance of songs", sounds somewhat surprising. It has usually been understood as referring to the "spell", the traditional remedy for love pains; but (i) Longus uses ᾧδή, "song", not ἐπωδή, "spell"; (ii) what immediately precedes proves that he is thinking of the song, in accordance with Theocr. 11.1–3: "I snapped my pipes because they succeeded in charming my beasts, but not in drawing Amaryllis to me" (2.7.6). Why, then, ἐν ᾧδαῖς λαλούμενον and not simply ᾧδαί? Perhaps the odd phraseology is a result of the author's care for stylistic symmetry, which required a balanced series of participles (πινόμενον ... ἐσθιόμενον ... λαλούμενον). According to Morgan (2004) 183–184 "the phrase 'uttered in song' has two levels: a) within the story it means chanted spells, parallel to potions and herbs as magic cures; b) for the reader it is meta-literary, answering Theocr.'s reference to the Muses. ... The ambiguity inscribes the crucial transition *DC* must negotiate from Theokritean to Longan world-view".

as a remedy for lovesickness, but also the idea of love meant almost exclusively to be a source of psychic and physical torment and languor. This condition of anguish and suffering that derives from unrequited passion, or an intrinsic inability (or a voluntary refusal) to love, is notoriously the dominant characteristic of Theocritus' shepherds, and also the subject of their songs.¹⁰ What the anonymous goatherd of *Id.* 3 says about himself, when he is refused by the haughty Amaryllis, is representative of them all (ll. 15–17):

νῦν ἔγνω τὸν Ἔρωτα· βαρὺς θεός· ἧ ῥα λεαίνας
μαζὸν ἐθήλαζεν, δρυμῷ τέ νιν ἔτραφε μάτηρ,
ὅς με κατασμήγων καὶ ἐς ὀστίον ἄχρις ἰάπτει.

now I have experienced Love: a baneful god. Undoubtedly he suckled at the breast of a lioness, and his mother brought him up in the forest. He burns me little by little, and destroys me to my innermost bones.

In his portrayal of love, Theocritus reflects above all on the negative dimension: the refusals, the sufferings, the nostalgic day-dreaming, the burning disappointments.¹¹ Eros is a *πικρός* (*Id.* 1.93) and *ἀργαλέος* (1.98) god *par excellence*. The representative and the symbol of this fundamentally pessimistic vision, which also extends to the world of the town, is Simichidas in *Id.* 7, who advises his friend Aratus, vainly in love with Philinus, to pursue *ἀσυχία*, namely a sort of *apatheia* that can immunise him from the risk of future sentimental entanglements (*Id.* 7.126–127).¹²

At the same time, however, as if to moderate his pessimism, Theocritus had proposed the 'cathartic' value of singing as a comfort for the sufferings of love. We receive palpable testimony to this effect in *Id.* 11, which describes the story of Polyphemus' unhappy love for Galatea. After the initial affirmation that the only remedy for lovesickness is offered by the Pierides, i.e. consists of singing, the poem comes to a circular conclusion with the observation that Polyphemus "nurtured (*ἐποίμεινεν*) his love by singing" (ll. 80–81).¹³ For Theocritus, therefore,

¹⁰ See Stanzel (1995).

¹¹ This theme is discussed in detail in Furusawa (1980) and in Stanzel (1995) 145–297.

¹² *ἀσυχία* may also mean the complete tranquillity of pastoral life, cf. Edquist (1975) and Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 138, 145–147. But the life of the herdsmen is itself troubled by love passion: the true *ἀσυχία* can be found—temporarily—only in the song.

¹³ The same verb is used by Longus with reference to the effect that Eros has on Daphnis and Chloe (2.5.3, cf. Eros ποιμήν 3.12.1). As Cozzoli (2000) 308 notes, Longus feels the need to enhance the bucolic dimension of the figure of Eros: the models from

singing eases and heals the pain caused by the wounds of passion: it is thus a true *pharmakon*.¹⁴

But what position does Longus adopt on this matter? He, too, knows full well that love is the cause of suffering. In the novel, after his first kiss from Chloe, Daphnis loses his appetite and even stops drinking; he becomes taciturn and indolent, and nearly forgets to look after his flock: “his shepherd’s pipe was thrown aside, his face was more lacklustre than the withered grass in summer” (1.17.4). The effect of the kiss was, for him, “more piercing than a bee’s sting”: he breathes with difficulty, his heart beats wildly, and his soul languishes within him (1.18.1). These are the classic symptoms of lovesickness, according to a tradition that goes back at least as far as Sappho, whose work Theocritus often re-elaborates in his poems, especially in *Id.* 28–30.¹⁵ And elsewhere, the intensity of the passion is described in terms that highlight the state of suffering of the two young shepherds, who are both in love with each other but are incapable of expressing their reciprocal desire.

Compared with Theocritus, however, Longus abandons the bucolic topos of singing as a therapy for lovesickness.¹⁶ Longus even goes so far as to openly declare the ineffectiveness of this cure: in his mad love for Amaryllis—says Philetas—“I snapped the pipes because they succeeded in charming my beasts, but not in drawing Amaryllis towards me” (2.7.6). There is no mention of singing as a possible *pharmakon* for love; music only exerts its magical effects on animals.¹⁷ In the monologues which in Longus replace, in a sense, the songs of Theocritus’

which he takes his inspiration for the epiphany of the god are Moschus 1 and Bion fr. 13 (cf. Hunter (1983a) 77–78).

¹⁴ I will not go into the merits of a possible (and very probable) ironic interpretation of the idyll here. Obviously, the irony does not concern the assertion *per se* that singing heals love pains (a traditional motif in the Greek literature), but its application to such a monstrous and atypical character as Polyphemus. What appears to be certain is that Theocr. 11.1–3 is taken by Longus at face value.

¹⁵ Analysed in Hunter (1983a) 73–76, Pretagostini (1997), Fassino and Prauscello (2001).

¹⁶ As Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) chap. 4.4 has copiously illustrated, the path towards a far less pessimistic concept of love had already been opened both by Moschus and even more clearly by Bion. See also Bernsdorff’s and Reed’s contributions in this volume.

¹⁷ This magic, however, belongs to the ‘mythical’ level of the story. As regards the mingling, visible at various points of the novel, of elements typical of a mythicised bucolic world and the concrete reality of pastoral life, cf. Reardon (1994) 135–147, Hunter (1996) 377–383.

shepherds (e.g. 1.14; 1.18),¹⁸ the two protagonists reflect on their emotional turmoil, but find no solace in this reflection; on the contrary, the comparison with nature, which follows its course, only serves to exacerbate their suffering because they feel alien to the harmony of the cosmic order. In reality, Eros invites the lovers to kiss, to embrace and to lie together naked: this is the only true remedy for lovesickness.¹⁹

3. *Theocritus, Virgil, Longus:* *a 'physiological' evolution in the bucolic tradition*

Longus substantially subverts one of the basic principles of Theocritus' poetics.²⁰ This frank divergence is clearly highlighted: it is found at the end of Philetas' speech, a particularly significant point structurally, and acts as both a synthesis of and closing seal for the speech. This discourse by Philetas deserves greater attention than it has received so far; it is my belief that the themes it touches upon raise questions that concern the very core of the concept of the novel. But who, in actual fact, is Philetas?

Philetas suddenly appears to Daphnis and Chloe while they are caught up in their innocent games (2.3.1). His attire recalls the figure

¹⁸ On the monologue-lament and the monologue-reflection in Longus, cf. Ferrini (1990) 77–82.

¹⁹ An interpretation of the advice given by Eros-Philetas to the two young people has recently been proposed, which I consider to be erroneous. According to Zeitlin (1990) 449, Philetas gives Daphnis and Chloe "the first social lessons about love (indeed, at Eros' behest)—both its mythic ideology and its blunter physiology—the latter, however, only up to a certain point ... Philetas' precepts suggest a preliminary stage that anticipates but is not yet ready ... for phallic consummation ... the message of the garden implies that it is not yet the right time for Daphnis and Chloe". The same interpretation can be found in Konstan (1994) 79–90. But it clearly leads to a *reductio ad absurdum*: Eros and Philetas would be giving Daphnis and Chloe, in all seriousness, a *pharmakon* which, far from comforting them, would only intensify their sufferings. In reality, it is only the innocent naivety of the two young people that stops them from understanding the advice that they are given in all its implications.

²⁰ The interpretations that have been offered so far would appear to be restrictive: Rohde (1937) 27–28 confines himself to speaking of an ironic *Umbiegung* with respect to Theocritus; Mittelstadt (1970) 227 sees in this passage only an innocent, affable criticism of the scanty realism of the advice given in Theocritus; Cresci (1981) 24 tends to exclude any polemical intention with respect to the 'model'. See, however, very recently, Morgan (2004) 183: "L(ongus)' reversal of these lines [namely Theocr. 11.1–3] is profoundly programmatic. For Theokr. Love is a hostile force which can only be controlled by its sublimation into art ... L(ongus)' Eros, by contrast, is a benevolent cosmic harmony to be 'cured' not by elimination but by fulfilment".

of Lycidas in Theocritus (*Id.* 7.15–19), i.e. the character who represents the very quintessence of bucolic poetry in the *Thalysia*: Lycidas is the shepherd-poet whose function is analogous to that of the Muses in Hesiod's *Theogony*, inasmuch as he sanctions the excellence of Simichidas-Theocritus as a bucolic singer.²¹ The impression that he plays an important role is immediately confirmed by his speech: he not only helps Daphnis and Chloe become aware of the love that attracts them to each other and recognize the need to give free rein to their passion through physical contact, but—more importantly—his speech proves to be so full of meta-literary allusions that it assumes, in the context of the novel, a clear programmatic significance, representing a true poetic declaration of intent.

Before we examine the most significant points of this speech in detail, it will be useful to reflect briefly on the role of Philetas as a *praeceptor amoris*, a role inspired by Eros himself. The god of love does not reveal himself directly to the young couple, nor does he appear to them in a dream:²² his epiphany is mediated by Philetas. It is to Philetas that Eros appears so that Philetas can then communicate the god's desires to the two protagonists. Indeed, Philetas has been granted an exclusive privilege: "rejoice, Philetas"—Eros says to him—"because you are the only man who has seen this darling boy in his old age" (2.5.5). What is the meaning of all this? Why does Philetas act as an intermediary between the god and the two young people? And why does Eros tell Philetas that he alone—and what is more, as an old man—has had the chance to see him?

We could easily imagine that the elderly Philetas is the mouthpiece of Longus the Sophist, but this interpretation is lacking in something. Instead, I believe that the author actually chose the various biographic details of his character in order to provide an allegorical representa-

²¹ Important works for the interpretation of this passage by Theocritus include, above all, Puelma (1960) 147–150 and Serrao (1977b) 202–208. When Daphnis subsequently demonstrates his ability as a *συνκρίτης*, Philetas kisses him, gives him his own *syrix*, and expresses the wish that one day Daphnis may hand it on to an equally skilful successor (2.37.3). The scene recalls the staff that Lycidas gives to Simichidas. Placed in the mouth of such an ostentatiously 'Theocritean' character, the correction of Theocr. 11.1–3 becomes even more meaningful.

²² And yet Longus makes use of the expedient of the dream at various significant moments of his narration (1.7, 2.23, 2.26–27, 4.34). Furthermore, the dream is the most immediate and common form in which the motif of the *apiston*, so widespread in the Greek novel, finds expression: cf. Stark (1989) 141–144. On the form of Eros' epiphany see Nickau (2002b).

tion of the history of the bucolic genre. Longus does not limit himself to suggesting his own personal association with Philetas, but characterises the preceding phases of the life of the old cowherd in such a way that the reader can detect the foreshadowing: first of the figure of Theocritus, then of the figure of Virgil. He thus aims to present himself as the heir carrying on a bucolic tradition that has undergone a “biological cycle” analogous to that of his character: before growing old, and therefore, before being associated with Longus, Philetas ‘underwent’ the literary experience of Theocritus, and subsequently that of Virgil. In simpler terms, we might say that the young Philetas represents Theocritus, while the Philetas of adulthood and maturity represents Virgil, and lastly, the elderly Philetas represents Longus himself.

Moreover, it is Eros himself who traces the relationship between Longus-Philetas and his predecessors. Recalling the various periods of the life of the elderly cowherd, the god recollects when Philetas was still very young and pastured a large herd of cattle on the mountains; immediately after this, the god speaks of the passion that burned in the cowherd’s heart for Amaryllis, when Philetas played his *syrinx* in the shade of the beech-trees (2.5.3):

καί σε οἶδα νέμοντα πρωθήβην ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ ὄρει τὸ πλατὺ βουκόλιον καὶ παρήμην σοι συρίπτοντι πρὸς ταῖς φηγοῖς ἐκείναις, ἥνικα ἦρας Ἀμαρυλλίδος.

I know that in your early youth you pastured a large herd of cattle on that mountain and I was close by as you played your pipe beside those beech-trees, when you were in love with Amaryllis.

The expressions that Eros uses to describe the previous experiences of Philetas are highly allusive, and appear distinctly to derive from two very well-known passages of the bucolic production, respectively, of Theocritus and Virgil. “Pasturing cattle in the mountains” is the exact equivalent of ἀν’ ὄρεα βουκολέοντα of Theocr. 7.92, that is to say the expression used by Theocritus himself, through the lips of Simichidas, to describe his own bucolic inspiration. See 7.91–93:

Λυκίδα φίλε, πολλὰ μὲν ἄλλα
Νύμφαι κῆμέ διδάξαν ἀν’ ὄρεα βουκολέοντα
ἐσθλά, τὰ που καὶ Ζηνὸς ἐπὶ θρόνον ἄγαγε φάμα.

The Muses taught many excellent songs to me, too, dear Lycidas, while I was pasturing the cattle in the mountains: songs which were raised up by their renown to the throne of Zeus.

There is no other passage in which Theocritus professes his bucolic ‘credo’ so explicitly. We are at the heart of *Id.* 7, the *Programmgedicht* of Theocritus, and at the crucial moment when Simichidas-Theocritus states his claim to be a bucolic poet in the presence of Lycidas. Applied to Simichidas, who is a town-poet, the expression “pasturing cattle in the mountains” clearly has a metaphorical meaning.²³ Significantly, in Erycius, *AP* 6.96 = *GPh* 2200ff. (Γλαύκων καὶ Κορύδων οἱ ἐν οὐρεσι βουκολέοντες, / Ἀρκάδες ἀμφοτέρω, κτλ., “Glaucôn and Corydon, who keep their cattle on the hills, Arcadians both, etc.”) the same expression οἱ ἐν οὐρεσι βουκολέοντες occurs immediately before the phrase Ἀρκάδες ἀμφοτέρω, which is almost certainly an intentional reminiscence of the bucolic Virgil (*Ecl.* 7.4 *Arcades ambo*):²⁴ this may clearly be an allusive “generic signal”.²⁵

There is another detail that must lead us to recognise the projection of the bucolic Theocritus in the still young Philetas. Surprisingly, Longus’ novel almost entirely eliminates from the lives of the shepherds the practice of singing, and in particular the composition of bucolic songs. The limited number of occurrences of the verb ᾄδειν and the noun ᾠδή almost all refer to occasions that differ from bucolic singing: even the contest between Daphnis and Dorcon (*Id.* 1.15.4–16.5)—though a judge and prize for the winner are considered, in accordance with the accepted rules of the bucolic contest—is not a singing competition, but an ἀγὼν λόγων. It is thus so much the more striking that Philetas presents himself at the beginning of his speech not only as a skilful συρικτῆς, but also as an author of pastoral songs (2.3.2):

Φιλητᾶς, ὃ παιῖδες, ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἐγώ, ὃς πολλὰ μὲν ταῖς Νύμφαις ἤσα, πολλὰ δὲ τῷ Πανὶ ἐκείνῳ ἐσύρισα, βοῶν δὲ πολλῆς ἀγέλης ἡγήσάμην μόνῃ μουσικῇ.

²³ Cf. Serrao (1977b) 205–208; Halperin (1983a), especially 120–124.

²⁴ Cf. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1906) 111 n. 1, Cichorius (1922) 306. Gow and Page (*GPh* vol. 2, 279) are sceptical.

²⁵ The connection between bucolic singing and the mountain is made explicit, e.g. in Theocr. 7.51 (τοῦθ’ ὅτι πρᾶν ἐν ὄρει τὸ μελῦδριον ἐξεπόνασα, “this little song that I composed just now on the mountainside”); 7.87 (ὥς τοι ἐγὼν ἐνόμειον ἂν’ ὥρεα τὰς καλὰς αἶγας / φωνᾶς εἰσαίων, τὸ δ’ ὑπὸ δρυσὶν ἢ ὑπὸ πεύκαις / ἀδὺ μελισδόμενος κατεκέκλαιο, “how gladly then I would have kept your pretty goats in the hills, listening to you; meanwhile beneath oak or pine you would lay and sing a sweet song”); [Theocr.] 8.1–2 (just before the bucolic contest: Δάφνιδι τῷ χαρίεντι συνήντητο βουκολέοντι / μῆλα νέμων, ὥς φαντί, κατ’ ὥρεα μακρὰ Μενάλκας, “Once the fair Daphnis, out upon the long hills with his cattle, met Menalcas keeping his sheep”).

O youngsters, I am the old Philetas. I have sung many times in honour of these Nymphs, many times have I played my pipe for the god Pan, who is over there, and I have guided a large herd of cattle only with my music.

“Singing many songs in honour of the Nymphs” is a practice that the poetic world of Longus does not appear to contemplate. This is further confirmation that Longus chose to transfer to the past of Philetas some features of the self-presentation by the bucolic poet Theocritus—that Theocritus who states that the Nymphs (N.B. the Nymphs, and not the Muses) are responsible for the inspiration of his song.²⁶

As regards the image in 2.5.3 of Philetas who, in his love for Amaryllis, plays his pipe *πρὸς ταῖς φηγοῖς ἐκείναις*, “under those oak-trees”, this is exactly the same as that of Tityrus at the beginning of Virgil’s *Ecl.* 1:

*Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi
siluestrem tenui musam meditaris auena;
nos patriae fines et dulcia linquimus arua:
nos patriam fugimus; tu, Tityre, lentus in umbra
formosam resonare doces Amaryllida silvas.*

You, Tityrus, under the spreading, sheltering beech, tune woodland musings on a delicate reed; we flee our country’s borders, our sweet fields, abandon home; you, lazing in the shade, make woods resound with lovely Amaryllis (trans. P. Alpers)

There is no doubt that Longus fully intended to recall Virgil by ‘quoting’ the *incipit* of the *Eclogues*. Moreover, the mention of the *φηγοί*—a tree that does not belong among the typical components of the Theocritean bucolic countryside²⁷—is an essential part of his allusive

²⁶ On the profound meaning of the substitution of the Nymphs for the Muses in the field of bucolic poetry, cf. Fantuzzi (2000); Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 147–148, 151–156.

²⁷ In *Id.* 12.8–10 (a *paidikon*), however, we find the image of the lover who, in the heat of his passion, races to his *eromenos* “like a wayfarer under a shady oak-tree (σκιερὴν ... ὑπὸ φηγόν) when the sun is burning”: according to Du Quesnay (1981) 50–51, this is where Virgil took his inspiration from. Cf. already Williams (1968) 317–319, who believes that the choice may have been influenced also by Nicander fr. 69 Gow-Schofield *φηγοί Πανὸς ἀγάλμα*, “oaks, the delight of Pan” (cf. Propert. 1.18.20 *fagus et Arcadio pinus amica deo*); the first who associated *φηγός* and *fagus* may have been Catull. 64.28. Callimachus, however, may also have had an influence on Virgil: Acontius in his love for Cydippe complains *φηγοῖς ὑποκαθήμενος ἢ πετέλειαις*, “sitting beneath oaks or elms” (Aristaen. 1.10, p. 57 Mazal). See also Kenney (1983) 49–50.

strategy: it is likely, as I have argued in greater detail elsewhere,²⁸ that φηγός is here perceived to be the exact equivalent of the Latin *fagus*.²⁹

A second echo of the same passage is found shortly afterwards (2.7.4–6):

αὐτὸς μὲν γὰρ ἦμιν νέος καὶ ἡράσθην Ἀμαρυλλίδος· καὶ οὔτε τροφῆς ἐμμενήμεν οὔτε ποτὸν προσεφερόμην οὔτε ὕπνον ἠροῦμην. ἤλγουν τὴν ψυχὴν, τὴν καρδίαν ἐπαλλόμεν, τὸ σῶμα ἐψυχόμην, ἐβόων ὡς παιόμενος, ἐσιώπων ὡς νεκρούμενος, εἰς ποταμοὺς ἐνέβαινον ὡς καόμενος. ἐκάλουν τὸν Πᾶνα βοηθόν, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸν τῆς Πίτυος ἐρασθέντα· ἐπῆνουν τὴν Ἥχῳ τὸ Ἀμαρυλλίδος ὄνομα μετ' ἐμὲ καλοῦσαν· κατέκλων τὰς σύριγγας, ὅτι μοι τὰς μὲν βοῦς ἔθελγον, Ἀμαρυλλίδα δὲ οὐκ ἦγον.

I, too, was once young, and I fell in love with Amaryllis, and forgot all about eating or drinking, and couldn't sleep. I suffered deep down inside, my heart beat wildly in my breast, my whole body was seized with trembling, I shrieked as if I had been beaten, I was as mute as a dead man, I threw myself into rivers as if I was on fire. I called Pan to my aid, because he, too, had fallen in love with Pitys; I commended Echo, who repeated the name of Amaryllis after me; I snapped my pipes because they succeeded in charming my beasts, but not in drawing Amaryllis to me.

The hypothesis of a “direkte Beziehung” between ἐπῆνουν τὴν Ἥχῳ τὸ Ἀμαρυλλίδος ὄνομα μετ' ἐμὲ καλοῦσαν and *formasam resonare doces Amaryllida silvas* (*Ecl.* 1.5) had already been advanced by Leo, who found the coincidence of expressions extremely “auffallend”.³⁰ By contrast, subsequent scholars have preferred to believe that the points of contact derive from a common source: Philitas of Cos. This opinion has been influenced by two prejudices: 1) the inclination to consider the presence of echoes of Latin authors in Greek texts highly unlikely; 2) the stubborn conviction—despite all the evidence—that Philitas was the initiator, or at least a precursor, of bucolic poetry, and that Longus would have called his character Philetas to pay a homage to this earlier poet, from whom he would have derived precise images and verbal suggestions in our passage in order to stress in his Philetas the echo of this

²⁸ Di Marco (2000) 27–28.

²⁹ The idea that for Longus φηγός meant the wild oak (and that this was therefore the meaning that he attributed to the Latin *fagus*) would seem to be confirmed by the fact that the tree under which Daphnis loves to sit is indifferently called δοῦς (1.13.4) and φηγός (2.30.2).

³⁰ Leo (1903) 3 n. 1.

predecessor.³¹ In my opinion, both of these ideas are not justified.³² It is true that, in the literary sphere, the Latin world's influence on that of Greece remained a fairly limited phenomenon, but this does not allow for broad generalisations. During the imperial age, the progressive convergence between Greek and Roman culture undoubtedly favoured the diffusion and the reading of texts in Latin among certain cultural elites of the Greek area: this has been demonstrated for several specific cases, including the novel,³³ and thus it comes as no surprise that Longus was able to read Virgil directly. Furthermore, various pieces of evidence would lead us to believe that Longus was, if not actually Italian,³⁴ at least a member of a Greek family, perhaps from Lesbos, who had continuous and close relations with Roman circles.³⁵

As to the name Φιλητᾶς, this is in no way a useful clue for linking the character of Longus with the poetic production of Philitas (or Philetas) of Cos.³⁶ On the contrary, Longus uses the name Φιλητᾶς as a 'speaking name', connected with the root of the verb φιλέω, as the words of Eros in 2.5.1 demonstrate (a true pun):

ἐμοὶ μὲν, ὦ Φιλητᾶ, φιλησαί σε φθόνος οὐδεὶς βούλομαι γὰρ φιλεῖσθαι
μᾶλλον ἢ σὺ γενέσθαι νέος.

I have no difficulty, Philetas, in giving you a kiss: I desire to be kissed even more than you desire to be young again.

The tendency to use speaking names is one that is characteristic of Longus: together with names deriving from the previous bucolic tradi-

³¹ After suggesting that Theocritus' Lycidas is a creation of Philitas, Bowie (1985) goes so far as to imagine that this character appears a third time in Longus, bearing the name of his first inventor.

³² Very speculative the analysis by Morgan (2004) 5 and 177: "Philetas' role as *praeceptor amoris* may well reflect a pose struck by Philitas, and his encounter with Eros in his metaliterary garden might allude to a typically Hellenistic meeting between Philitas and his inspiring god" ... "although the details elude us, the poet is clearly a major intertextual presence in this scene".

³³ A concise documentation with relative bibliography can be found in Di Marco (2000) 23–24.

³⁴ The proposal advanced by Herrmann (1981), to associate him with a grammarian of the 2nd century AD, is not convincing.

³⁵ Cf. Cichorius (1922) 321–323, Hunter (1983a) 2–3. *Contra*, e.g., MacQueen (1990) 189–195, Bowie (1994) 451–452.

³⁶ This is true regardless of the spelling or accenting of the name: the correct form is probably Φιλίτας and not Φιλητᾶς. These considerations have their weight, but are perhaps not cogent. The most complete and knowledgeable discussion of the name is found in Müller (1990) 27–37. Cf. also Sbardella (2000) 3–7.

tion (Daphnis, Tityrus etc.) and those clearly connected with the rustic and pastoral environment that he describes (e.g. Chloe, Dryas, Agele) there are several names in the novel that reveal an essential quality of the relative characters: Dorcon, Lycaenion, Astylus, Eudromus, Philopoemen, Gnathon.³⁷ Φιλητᾶς belongs to the latter category: in that it evokes the idea of a kiss, it is the most suitable name for the *praeceptor amoris* role played by this character.

4. Longus vs Theocritus (and Virgil): a different idea of love

Very few scholars have seriously considered the hypothesis that there are direct echoes of Virgil in Longus; they are alleged to be only incidental, minor resonances.³⁸ I believe, on the contrary, that an analysis of Philetas' speech leads precisely to the opposite conclusion. The gratuitous nature—in terms of narrative logic—of the details of the biography of Philetas is in itself an indication that these details have really been introduced by Longus with an allegoric intent.

Let us then try a re-reading of the passage, 2.5.3, examined above (p. 487). The allusion to Theocritus in Longus' καὶ σε οἶδα νέμοντα πρωθήβην ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ ὄρει τὸ πλατὺ βουκόλιον is immediately followed by the allusion to Virgil:

καὶ παρήμην σοι συρίττοντι πρὸς ταῖς φηγοῖς ἐκείναις, ἥνικα ἦρας Ἀμαρυλλίδος· ἀλλὰ με οὐχ ἑώρας καίτοι πλησίον μάλα τῇ κόρῃ παρεστῶτα. σοὶ μὲν οὖν ἐκείνην ἔδωκα· καὶ ἤδη σοι παῖδες, ἀγαθοὶ βουκόλοι καὶ γεωργοί.

and I was close by as you played your pipe beside those beech-trees, when you were in love with Amaryllis; but you did not see me, even if I was very close to the maiden. I gave her to you as a wife; and now you have children who are skilful herdsman and farmers.

The expression “you did not see me, even if I was very close to the maiden”, which seems otherwise incomprehensible, acquires real meaning in light of what I proposed above: Virgil, i.e. the adult Phile-

³⁷ As regards the names of Longus' characters, and the probable derivation of most of them from previous literary tradition, cf. Wendel (1901) 37–42.

³⁸ Besides Leo (above, n. 30), cf. Edmonds (1916) VII, Valley (1926) 90. The position of Schönberger (1989) 190–191 is ambiguous. In reality, as has rightly been observed, the novel is “almost entirely mimetic, depending for its content and expression on what went before, a hallucinating echo text that is constituted as a secondary or even tertiary signifying system” (Zeitlin (1990) 438). On Longus' familiarity with the *Eclogues* see Hubbard's contribution to this volume, pp. 499ff.

tas, was not capable of truly perceiving Eros. The only person to whom the god openly reveals himself is Longus, i.e. the elderly Philetas.³⁹

However, beginning from the details offered by Virgil's *Ecl.* 1, Longus invents a sequel for his character's love story with Amaryllis. The love of Philetas for the girl has known moments of high pathos (2.7.4–6). This stage of suffering has, however, felicitously been weathered.⁴⁰ We have already learned from Eros that Philetas married Amarillys and had children with her. It is possible that this sequel—which goes beyond the picture described by Virgil with regard to the relationship between Tityrus and Amaryllis—was invented by Longus on the basis of the characterisation of Amaryllis in Virgil's *Ecl.* 1: here, she returns the love of Tityrus and, without any of the negative qualities she shows in other eclogues, it is as if she “becomes the symbol of the ideal companion for a simple, hard-working rustic life”.⁴¹ In Virgil, therefore, Longus already found an initial, albeit isolated, indication of progress towards a less pessimistic concept of love than in Theocritus. It is now his task, in his pastoral novel, to complete this evolution:⁴² the story of the two young shepherds who fall in love, marry, and live happily ever after with their children concludes and seals the cycle begun long before, in the bucolic poetry of Theocritus.⁴³

³⁹ For further observations, see n. 45.

⁴⁰ Konstan (1994) 83 n. 54 does not appreciate the real reason why Philetas passes from a phase of unfulfilled love to married bliss: “Philetas's love is at first apparently unreciprocated (2.7.4–6, 2.8.5), after the fashion of *eros* in pastoral poetry (the name Amaryllis suggests the genre), but, in spirit of the novel, it ends in marriage”. This development is in reality the metaphor for an evolution—wholly literary—that leads to a different concept of bucolic love in Longus.

⁴¹ Thus Serrao (1984) 123. Cf. Du Quesnay (1981) 38–39: “Amaryllis is not only the beloved of Tityrus but also his *conserva* or *contubernalis* and responsible for the care of the farm in his absence. There is nothing precisely similar in Theocritus”.

⁴² In fact, as Theodore Papanghelis points out to me, what Longus presents as his own contribution is not just a supplementation of what happens in bucolic scenarios but a definite contamination of bucolic scenarios (which do not seriously envisage a marital bond) with the happy endings of the novel tradition.

⁴³ An allusion to Virgil may perhaps be seen also where we read that, after marrying Amaryllis, Philetas had children who became ἀγαθοὶ βουκόλοι καὶ γεωργοί, “jolly herdsmen and farmers” (2.5.3). In a context full of references to Virgil, this expression does not pass unobserved: should we interpret this as an appreciation not only for the bucolic Virgil, but also for the georgic Virgil, seeing that Longus' novel shows considerable interest also in the world of agriculture? An analysis of the world of *Daphnis and Chloe* which devotes attention to the use of spaces and productive activities can be found in Longo (1978); cf. also Scarcella (1968).

Longus could not have devised a more emphatic way, albeit through the veil of allusion, to claim a position in bucolic poetry, while at the same time emphasizing his original and peculiar way of describing the pastoral world. This originality is revealed, as we have seen, in his treatment of the theme of love: unlike the poetic world of his predecessors, and Theocritus in particular, the love of Daphnis and Chloe is not a love that is merely the stuff of dreams, nor is it even contrasted by effects of repression and despondency; on the contrary, it is open and positive. It mellows progressively, following a perfectly natural course—even if it requires teaching by someone who is already an expert for its complete fulfilment—⁴⁴ and despite the inevitable sufferings it causes, it is capable of bringing joy to those who fully experience it. In my opinion, it is exactly to this different concept that Longus is alluding when he makes Eros say that he has appeared only to the elderly Philetas: he intends to suggest that Theocritus and Virgil did not encounter Eros directly, because they perceived only a partial aspect of love, and sang only of the bitterness deriving from the inability or impossibility of the shepherds to fulfil their passions.⁴⁵ In the novel, on the contrary, Eros reveals himself completely: as desire, but also as the embrace of the lovers; as sentimental transport, but also as physical contact; and lastly, in a perspective tending to exalt the value of the generating force of the universe,⁴⁶ above all as a happy union and marriage. Within the bucolic tradition, all of these are found together

⁴⁴ It is nature that leads the young people to the discovery of love, but for Longus, as we know, nature by itself is not enough. The theme of the *paideia*, necessary for lovers, which is already present in the proem (§3), and the presence of a *praeceptor amoris* and then of Lycanion, with whom Daphnis has his first sexual relationship (3.15–19), are to be seen in the light of the φύσις/τέχνη dialectic, which is one of the leading motifs of the novel. For an analysis of this dialectic, cf. Teske (1991).

⁴⁵ The relationship between Tityrus and Amaryllis in *Ecl.* 1 is an exception. As we have seen, Longus takes note of this, but at the same time he appears to blame Virgil for not understanding that this was the direction in which the theme of love between shepherds was to be developed. This may explain the particular—which would otherwise be extraordinary—that when Eros declares that he had favoured the marriage of Philetas and Amaryllis, he points out that even if he was close to Philetas in the past when he played his pipe for the woman he loved, the latter had not even noticed his presence.

⁴⁶ Chalk (1960) rightly insists on this aspect, albeit at times with undue implications. Cf. also Rohde (1937) and Reardon (1969) 301: “in Longus we are presented with a natural religion, a religion of nature, which itself comprehends the concept of love, indeed is identical with it”.

only in Longus, who is a late member of this tradition: this is why Eros can say that he reveals himself only to Philetas, and only when he is in his old age.

5. *Philetas' garden: its symbolic function*

The marriage of Philetas and Amaryllis anticipates and prepares the marriage of Daphnis and Chloe: as is appropriate for a *praeceptor amoris*, Philetas illustrates the contents of his lesson by means of his own personal experience.⁴⁷ Marriage is the natural ending of the novel; it is the final fulfilment of Philetas' advice, subsequently accomplished by Lycaenion, the woman who physically initiates Daphnis to sex. In this perspective, there is a sort of narrative climax, which is accompanied by the textual strategy of literary allusions. It is no coincidence, for example, that in the first part of the novel, when the passion is kindled between the two young people, Longus borrows from Sappho his description of the symptoms of love (1.17.4 ~ fr. 31.14–15 Voigt; 1.18.1 and 2.7.5 ~ fr. 31.5–6 V.) and the image of a bittersweet Eros (3.14.3 ~ fr. 130 V.), or that, when marriage finally appears to be a certain prospect, he draws inspiration from an epithalamium by the Lesbian poetess in order to introduce the scene of Daphnis picking the last apple from the topmost branch (3.33.4 ~ fr. 105a V.). Thus we pass from a love that blazes and initially causes torment to a love that is gratified and finds fulfilment in marriage. The Sapphic echoes accompany the process of Daphnis and Chloe's maturation, and the epithalamium is 'quoted' to underscore the fact that the long-prepared process has finally reached its natural conclusion.⁴⁸

Once the allegorical meaning of Philetas' story is clear, the garden where he says he met Eros proves to be, in reality, a metaphor of something quite different (2.3.3 and 2.5.4):

κῆρός ἐστί μοι τῶν ἐμῶν χειρῶν, ὃν ἐξ οὗ νέμειν διὰ γῆρας ἐπανσάμην
ἐξεποννησάμην, ὅσα ὥραι φέρουσι, πάντα ἔχων ἐν αὐτῷ καθ' ὥραν ἐκάστην.

⁴⁷ Schönberger (1989) 188: "Philetas erzählt in seiner Selbstvorstellung dasselbe von sich, was Daphnis und Chloe tun. Er ist ihr Vorgänger". Also from the point of view of the conventions typical of the pastoral world, the fact that Philetas is a cowherd qualifies him to be a *magister amoris* for Daphnis, who is a goatherd. Cf. Cozzoli (2000).

⁴⁸ It is equally significant that in this precise context Longus reworks the famous scene of the *locus amoenus* in *Id.* 7.132–146, with the description of a nature that is particularly rich in already ripe fruit.

... νῦν δὲ Δάφνιν ποιμαίνω καὶ Χλόην· καὶ ἡνίκα ἂν αὐτοὺς εἰς ἕν συνα-
γάγω τὸ ἐωθινόν, εἰς τὸν σὸν ἔρχομαι κῆπον καὶ τέρπομαι τοῖς ἄνθεσι καὶ
τοῖς φυτοῖς καὶ ταῖς πηγαῖς ταύταις λούομαι.

I have a garden, which is the work of my hands: I set it up when I stopped taking the animals out to pasture, due to my old age. It contains everything that the seasons produce. ... Now I am the shepherd of Daphnis and Chloe, and when I unite them at dawn, I come into your garden and delight in the flowers and the plants, and bathe in these fountains.

In practice what does it mean that, once he has united Daphnis and Chloe, Eros will take his delight in the garden of Philetas? We have only one possible answer: the garden of Philetas—created with the typical components of the *locus amoenus*, and in many ways similar to Sappho's grove sacred to Aphrodite (fr. 2 Voigt), and even more similar to the garden of the Virgins of Ibycus (*PMGF* 286)—is not only the garden of Eros, the garden which, like love, is renewed at every season with an uninterrupted vitality; it is also the symbol of the work of Longus itself. This work is dominated by the constant presence of Eros,⁴⁹ who exerts his influence on the protagonists of the novel, leading them gradually to maturity, like the flowers and the fruits, by following the course of the seasons.⁵⁰

Philetas, who by now is old and has retired from his work as a cowherd, dedicating himself to the care of a garden frequented by Eros, can thus be identified with Longus, who has given up “pasturing on the mountainside”, i.e. traditional bucolic poetry, and has composed a work in which he has added to the traditional bucolic theme the

⁴⁹ In more general terms also Pandiri (1985) 118 and 133 argues that “Philetas’ garden is a suitable emblem for Longus’ *ktema* as a whole” and for “the *hortus conclusus* of literary pastoral”: “carefully landscaped, protected on all sides from wild nature by a barrier, it creates the illusion of a free natural setting as it ought, ideally, to be”.

⁵⁰ The interpretation of Forehand (1976) addresses another level: he detects a “Platonic trend” in the novel, and considers the garden of Philetas and that of Lamon, described at the beginning of Book 4, as ideal projections of a pastoral world which, in opposition to the urban world, fulfils the aspiration to “a place where there is maximum opportunity to find real knowledge of Love and true happiness”: one represents “an intensification”, the other “a perfection of the pastoral ideal”. On the garden of Lamon see Longo (1978) 110–112, 119–120 and Morgan (2004) 223–225. For other interpretations of its symbolic function see Winkler (1990) 101–126, Alpers (1996) 331–332. In any case the garden of Lamon plainly displays many features of the *paradeisos* (and of the estate of the Roman villa) we find elsewhere in the literary tradition (Grimal (1969)). For the ‘eroticisation’ of plants and flowers—a motif well attested in Theocritus (*Id.* 10.28–29, 11.21, 12.3–4)—cf. [Lucian] *Amor.* 12, Achilles Tat. 1.15 and 1.19.1, Nonn. 3.140–163 (and see Elliger (1975), 421–423).

subject of the celebration of love, experienced in its fullest dimension. Furthermore, by likening his literary activity to the care of a κήπος, Longus places himself in the wake of a tradition which includes illustrious precedents, e.g. Pindar, *Ol.* 9.27 Χαρίτων νέμομαι κᾶπον, “I cultivate the garden of the Graces” and Plato, *Ion* 534b ἐκ Μουσῶν κήπων τινῶν καὶ ναπῶν δρεπόμενοι τὰ μέλη, “culling the songs in certain gardens and glades of the Muses”.

One last formal indication confirms our line of interpretation: the verb that Philetas uses when he talks about setting up his garden (ἐξεπονησάμην) is the same word used by Theocritus in the *Thalysia* (7.51), when Lycidas underlines the formal care, or the πόνοϛ, the *labor*, that the song which he presents to Simichidas had required:

... ὄρη, φίλος, εἴ τοι ἀρέσκει
τοῦθ' ὅτι πρᾶν ἐν ὄρει τὸ μελύδριον ἐξεπόνασα.

see, my dear, if you like this little song that I composed just now on the mountainside.

Even more significantly, the same verb, in the same form ἐξεπονησάμην, recurs in the proem of the novel, where Longus says that he has written four books, dedicating them to Eros, the Nymphs and Pan, that they might be a pleasant possession for all men (*prae*f. 3 τέτταρας βίβλους ἐξεπονησάμην ... κτῆμα ... τερπνὸν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, “I drew up these four books, ... a delightful possession for all men”). The fact that the same verb is used for both the composition of the books of the novel and for the meticulous care shown by Philetas for his garden is surely not coincidental:⁵¹ on the contrary, it is the clearest evidence that the garden of Philetas, which Eros finds so delightful, is no less than the symbol of the work of Longus,⁵² at least in the perspective of the allegory created by the author.⁵³

⁵¹ This fact has also been pointed out by others: cf. in particular Zimmermann (1994) 207 and Morgan (2004) 177.

⁵² Similar conclusions, although from a different perspective, are presented in Zeitlin (1994) 163: “he (*scil.* Longus) ... claims Philetas’ territory as the site of writing, linking his authorial labors (in the proem) with the gardener’s task through their joint use of the verb ἐκπονέομαι, and he aligns the didactic role of his erotic work (e.g., *προσπαίδευσαι*) with that of the old poet-gardener’s instructive (and traditional) role of *praeceptor amoris* (or *erotodidaskalos*; cf. *παιδεύσας*, 2.8.1). In this way, he identifies himself with Philetas and even more with Eros himself, who, at all the crucial moments of the story, is made to write the plot from within the text”.

⁵³ This paper largely reproduces Di Marco (2000). English translation from Italian by J. Hanink, R. Packham, and T.D. Papangelis.

VIRGIL, LONGUS, AND THE PIPES OF PAN

THOMAS K. HUBBARD

It has long been assumed that Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*, like most Greek literature of the Second Sophistic, relies exclusively on Greek models.¹ I wish to argue, on the contrary, that Longus must have been familiar with the *Eclogues* of Virgil and indeed that Virgil's work was central to his thorough sentimentalization of the pastoral world. As David Halperin has shown, the more romanticized and nostalgic "pastoral" vision of Virgil is to be sharply distinguished from the irony and unsentimentalized naturalism of Theocritus' bucolic idylls, replete with the smell of goats, thorns in the foot, and accounts of whipping or pederastic rape.² Although it is possible that Theocritus' Greek successors may have moved somewhat closer to Virgil's ideal stereotype, even among these poets one finds scant evidence of sentimentality or pathos.³ As I argued in *The Pipes of Pan*, Bion was classified as a "bucolic poet" by Hellenistic scholars not because his poetry really had much to do with shepherds or the countryside, but because he programmatically invoked Theocritus as a precursor and foil to his own work, whose content was largely mythological and erotic.⁴ In Moschus' extant poetry

¹ See, for example, Rohde (1937) 27–47, Mittelstadt (1966) 169–171, Cresci (1981) 3–25, Effe (1982) 68–69, Schönberger (1989) 18–23. Scarcella (1971) 35–54 studies Longus' technique of Homeric reminiscence. Valley (1926) 79–104 gives the most detailed catalogue of similarities to earlier Greek literature, but does not exclude the possibility of allusion to Virgil as well; he nevertheless sees Virgil as a much less important source. Mittelstadt (1970) 215–220 specifically denies Virgilian influence, but admits that Longus' idealizing conception of the pastoral world is much more akin to Virgil's than to anything in Greek bucolic tradition. Vieillefond (1987) cxxix–cxxx points to some possible Virgilian parallels, but is undecided on the question of actual influence.

² Halperin (1983a), especially 1–23.

³ However, Rohde (1914) 537–543, argues that idealization of the countryside was a theme in a range of Greek works in the Hellenistic and Imperial periods, as diverse as Callimachus' *Hecale*, Dio Chrysostom's *Euboean Oration*, and the works of the Epicureans, and that these form the proper background to understanding Longus' idealized conception of the pastoral world. Rohde (1914) 549–551, also emphasizes, correctly, that Longus' sentimentality and appearance of naivety are artfully constructed narrative poses on the part of an undoubtedly sophisticated author.

⁴ Hubbard (1998) 37–41.

we find even less reference to truly bucolic themes. In the *Epitaph for Bion*, falsely attributed to Moschus, we see pathetic fallacy and other conventions stretched to the point of hyperbole, but even here we miss the deftness of touch and empathy common to both Virgil and Longus. Richard Hunter has shown that Philetas' description of Eros (2.3–7) probably owes something to the work of Moschus and Bion,⁵ but there is little evidence that their influence extended much beyond this passage.

Virgil's sentimentality is conveyed not so much in his actual narrative descriptions of the pastoral landscape as in the imaginative visualizations of that landscape by his characters: e.g. Corydon's enthusiastic offer of country delights to Alexis in *Ecl.* 2, Gallus' Arcadian fantasies of sexual freedom in *Ecl.* 10, or Meliboeus' evocation of a happy world lost in *Ecl.* 1. In every case, this idealizing projection is framed in the subjunctive mode either as a wish or as an Eden that is irretrievably vanished; even in the one case where a bounteous pastoral universe is described in the narrator's own voice, namely in the Messianic *Ecl.* 4, it is a visionary prophecy of a political future whose realization was far from certain in 40 BC. This elusive remoteness of the pastoral ideal is each time conditioned by the proximity of the City: Alexis and Gallus are creatures of the City; Meliboeus and the shepherds of *Ecl.* 9 lose their lands to confiscations decreed by the political authorities.

Longus' sentimentality goes beyond Virgil's in that the subjunctive becomes the indicative, and the discursive leisure of a prose narrative allows him to elaborate the green world in its modest, but self-sufficient plenitude. What Longus shares with Virgil, however, is the sense that this comfortable and happy world is under threat by political forces. In Virgil, the City intruded in the form of land confiscations; in Longus, it comes in the form of pirate raids (1.28–31), the homosexual parasite Gnathon (4.11–20), or, most prominently, the young hunters from Methymna and the army that comes to avenge their conflict with the shepherds (2.12–29).⁶ Indeed, at the end of the novel, the City ultimately

⁵ Hunter (1983a) 77–78. Valley (1926) 88–89, suggests a couple of other possible parallels, but they are not as compelling. Christie (1973) 247, suggests that the concept of mutual and fulfilled love, such as that found in *Daphnis and Chloe*, is completely absent from Theocritus, but incorporated to some degree into the bucolic landscape of his Greek successors.

⁶ In an article that the author shared with me prior to its publication, but after the composition of my own essay, Paschalis (2005) also comments on this affinity between

does reclaim Daphnis and Chloe from the countryside, when they are revealed to have been the abandoned children of rich families in Mytilene, and their happy pastoral life becomes an allegory for the blissful state of childhood innocence, which must be left behind as they assume the responsibilities of wedded maturity. This prominence of the City as a counterpoint and threat to the pastoral world is quite without precedent in Greek bucolic poetry: the worst that Theocritus can offer is Simichidas and his friends on a rural holiday in *Id.* 7, but they are clearly no threat to the Harvest Festival they visit. Any form of political protest is out of character for Hellenistic poetry: to the extent that a political element enters, it is purely encomiastic and honorific.

The elderly teacher Philetas in Longus' novel has long been thought to allude to the early Hellenistic poet Philetas of Cos, who was a significant precursor of Theocritus and is even explicitly named by Simichidas in *Id.* 7.40 as one of his models.⁷ I believe this identification must be correct: Philetas' initial appearance in the novel (2.3) presents him dressed in a goatskin with an old bag hanging from his shoulder; he meets Daphnis and Chloe at the time of the Harvest Festival on Lesbos. This picture clearly evokes the sudden appearance of the goatherd Lycidas in *Id.* 7.11–20, who also wears a goatskin, is girdled by an old tunic, and meets the travellers on the occasion of a Harvest Festival on Cos.⁸ Lycidas also acts as a poetic initiator to the aspiring poet Simichidas, and as I argued in *The Pipes of Pan*, he should in fact be seen as an allegorical mask for Philetas of Cos, even as Simichidas is for Theocritus. Longus thus reads and explicates the allegory of this passage by assigning to the character modelled on Lycidas the name of the poet for whom Lycidas stood.

In an important essay published in 1990, Froma Zeitlin has shown that mimesis is a fundamental theme of the novel, in the realms of both life and art.⁹ Even as Philetas of Cos offered a model to Theocritus and Lycidas did to Simichidas, the character of Philetas fulfills the

Virgil and Longus. He stops short of arguing for direct influence, but sees this common thread as a matter of "parallel developments".

⁷ See Reitzenstein (1893) 260 n. 1, Legrand (1898) 154–156, Hunter (1983a) 78–81, Bowie (1985) 68–80, Schönberger (1989) 188. For my own remarks, see Hubbard (1998) 24–26. For a different view, cf. Di Marco, this volume, pp. 490–492.

⁸ As Bowie (1985) 75 observes, Philetas, *CA* 17 presents a rustic character clad in a dirty tunic and with waist surrounded by a belt of plaited rushes, who may be a model for either or both.

⁹ Zeitlin (1990) 417–464.

same role for the aspiring young musician Daphnis. But whereas the staff was the programmatic medium of investiture in Philetas (*CA* 10 = fr. 25 Spanoudakis = 12 Sbardella), and Theocritus (*Id.* 7.128–129), even as in Hesiod before them (*Theog.* 22–35), the *syrix* is the gift through which Philetas invests Daphnis in Longus' novel. I would argue that this change must be due to the influence of Virgil (*Ecl.* 2.31–39), whose work may be alluded to at more than one point in Longus' narrative of Philetas. Daphnis and Chloe's begging the reluctant Philetas to perform for them (2.33) reminds us of the boys trying to extort a song out of the wise old Silenus in *Ecl.* 6.13–26. After Philetas agrees to play, he first tries with Daphnis' pipes, but finds them too small and childish to be adequate, so he sends his youngest child, who is named "Tityrus", to retrieve his own instrument. Meanwhile, Daphnis' adoptive father Lamon sings the story of Pan and Syrinx, which he had heard from a "Sicilian goatherd". This Sicilian goatherd is surely meant as a reference to Theocritus, to whom the pattern poem named *Syrinx* was attributed (*AP* 15.21).¹⁰ I would suggest that Philetas' youngest child Tityrus should be seen as a reference to the most recent member in the succession of pastoral poets, namely Virgil, who elevated Tityrus from being a very minor and secondary figure in Theocritus to the shepherd most emblematic of Virgilian pastoral; as I demonstrated in *The Pipes of Pan*, the first lines of *Ecl.* 1 were so well retained in readers' memory that the name of Tityrus came to be synonymous with that of Virgil in subsequent pastoral poetry.¹¹

This identification is made all the more likely when we consider the close correspondences between this scene and the programmatic passage where Virgil most clearly expresses his understanding of literary tradition, *Ecl.* 2.31–39:¹²

¹⁰ See Pandiri (1985) 131. Gow (1952) vol. 2, 553–554, argues against its authenticity, but Wojaczyk (1969) 91–104, defends it. Given that the first verse of the poem proclaims its authorship by Theocritus, Longus surely cannot be faulted for believing it to be a genuine work of that author, even if it were not.

¹¹ Virgil himself already seems to make the self-identification programmatic in *Ecl.* 6.4, introducing the second half of the collection with Apollo addressing the poet in the persona of "Tityrus". See Hubbard (1998) 168–169 for my argument that Martial (8.55.7–12) and Calpurnius Siculus (4.59–63) already used "Tityrus" as a code name for Virgil, as Servius and later traditions of Virgilian commentary clearly allegorized the name (Servius *ad Buc.* 1.1). Interestingly, Calpurnius also mentions Tityrus in the context of a succession of owners of the pipe.

¹² For my interpretation of this passage's programmatic significance, see Hubbard (1998) 62–64.

*mecum una in siluis imitabere Pana canendo
(Pan primum calamos cera coniungere pluris
instituit, Pan curat ouis ouiumque magistros),
nec te paeniteat calamo trivisse labellum:
haec eadem ut sciret, quid non faciebat Amyntas?
est mihi disparibus septem compacta cicutis
fistula, Damoetas dono mihi quam dedit olim,
et dixit moriens: "te nunc habet ista secundum";
dixit Damoetas, invidit stultus Amyntas.*

Together with me you will imitate Pan in the woods by singing (Pan first taught us to join several reeds with wax; Pan cares for sheep and the masters of sheep), nor should you be ashamed to have rubbed your lip with the reed: what would Amyntas not do to learn these same arts? I have a panpipe fixed together out of seven unequal reeds, which Damoetas once gave me as a gift, and he said as he died: "Let it now have you as its second owner". Damoetas so spoke, and the fool Amyntas was envious.

As Lamon sings the story of Pan and Syrinx (2.34.3 = Πάν ... τὸ ὄργανον νοεῖ καὶ τοὺς καλάμους κηρῷ συνδήσας ἀνίσους, καθ' ὅτι καὶ ὁ ἔρως ἄνισος αὐτοῖς, "Pan ... invented the instrument by joining together with wax the unequal reeds, inasmuch as their love had also been unequal"), he describes Pan fashioning the first panpipes, fastening together with wax reeds of unequal length; in 1.10.2 Daphnis creates panpipes for himself by the same procedure. Lamon's story expands upon ll. 32–37 in Virgil, where Pan is presented as the first to teach shepherds how to make pipes in this way. No parallel is available in our remains of Greek bucolic. Although the myth of Pan and Syrinx probably had Greek roots,¹³ these passages are unique in bringing the primal moment of the pipes' fabrication together with the act of succession.

Tityrus arrives with his father's heavy, brass-bound pipes, which are described as being like those that Pan first made. Philetas plays several different melodies and the narrator declares these pipes capable of imitating all the panpipes in existence (2.35.4 ὅλως πάσας σύριγγας μία σύριγξ ἐμμήσατο, "his one *syrinx* was able to imitate all *syringes* in every way"), thus bringing to the foreground the pipes' instrumentality in the interactive discourse of literary tradition, able to imitate and assimilate all precursors and rivals. Indeed, this line could even be read as Longus'

¹³ The lateness of the myth's attestation gives rise to the sense that it must have been a literary invention: no secure source before Virgil alludes to it. The ps.-Theocritean *Syrinx* (*AP* 15.21.4–8) is of uncertain date (see n. 10 above). See Wernicke (1902) 1467, and Ostern (1915) 1643.

programmatic announcement that his own pastoral music is not limited to any one precursor (i.e. Theocritus), but includes all previous players of the *syrinx* (such as Moschus, Bion, and Virgil).

Daphnis then tries his hand at several other tunes with these pipes and does so well that Philetas gives him the impressive instrument, as a worthy inheritor, and exhorts him to find a worthy heir in turn (2.37.3 ὥστε ὁ Φιλητᾶς θαυμάσας φιλεῖ τε ἀναπηδήσας καὶ τὴν σύριγγα χαρίζεται φιλήσας καὶ εὐχεται καὶ Δάφνιν καταλιπεῖν αὐτὴν ὁμοίῳ διαδόχῳ, “so Philetas expresses his amazement and leaps up to kiss Daphnis, and after kissing him makes a gift of his *syrinx* and entreats Daphnis to leave it behind in turn to a similar successor”). The presentation of the pipes is clearly an acknowledgement that Daphnis has now arrived at a sufficient maturity in his craft to handle an adult’s instrument and to play on a level with Philetas himself,¹⁴ indeed to play on a pipe that can play the same tunes as any other pipe and that might have even been Pan’s own pipe at the beginning of the tradition.

This unambiguous presentation of the pipes as the vehicle of literary imitation and tradition would appear to echo Virgil’s depiction of the dying Damoetas bequeathing his pipes to Corydon and Corydon in turn offering them to the young Alexis. Moreover, both passages are preceded by evocations of Pan as the original inventor and teacher of the *syrinx*, the *Urbukoliker*. Even though Longus may here echo Virgil, he simultaneously minimizes Virgil’s importance by granting the inheritance of Philetas, in some sense a forerunner and ancestor of Greek bucolic poetry, to his creation Daphnis, rather than letting the pipes go to Philetas’ own son Tityrus, who of course stands for Virgil. Longus thereby credits himself, rather than Virgil, with being the true heir of Greek bucolic tradition, and revalorizes the tradition as properly Greek by naming his title character not after one of Virgil’s shepherds, but after the Daphnis who was already legendary by the time of Theocritus’ *Id.* 1.¹⁵

¹⁴ Alpers (1996) 330–331 emphasizes the “phallic implications” of the big *vs* small pipes, and sees Daphnis and Chloe’s dancing in imitation of the story of Pan and Syrinx, as well as Daphnis’ playing love melodies on his newly acquired adult pipes as a “rite of passage by which the young lovers dance their way into adult sexuality”.

¹⁵ Diod. Sic. 4.84 treats Daphnis as a traditional mythological figure and gives details of his story not available in any of our extant literary sources; the parallel with Parthenius, *Erot. Path.* 29, explicitly attributed to Timaeus, suggests that Timaeus, who is frequently used as a source by Diodorus, may have also been behind his information. See Reitzenstein (1893) 196–203, and Halperin (1983b), drawing on Berg (1965) 11–23. Wojacek (1969) 5–21 surveys the pre-Longan sources concerning this figure.

The close parallelism between the succession metaphors in Longus and *Ecl.* 2 was noted over 20 years ago by Ian Du Quesnay.¹⁶ He adds that the same motif is also evoked in Dorcon's dying gift of his *syrinx* to Chloe in 1.29.2–3. However, Du Quesnay is resolutely unwilling to believe that a Greek author of Longus' time could have read Virgil or considered him a source worthy of imitation, and therefore argues that both Longus and Virgil must have been drawing upon a common source in the work of Philetas of Cos. This conclusion I regard as very unlikely. As I suggested earlier, the initiatory instrument in both Philetas and Theocritus was the staff, not the *syrinx*; if the *syrinx* truly had so much significance as a metaphor of poetic succession in Philetas, one would fully expect to find a significant echo in the work of Theocritus or Callimachus. Second, this pastoral metaphor of poetic succession presupposes the existence of a long tradition of poets forming a clear sequence of literary filiation in writing a certain type of poetry. This certainly did not yet exist in Philetas' era, and at least within the bucolic context cannot have existed until a canon of poets was established, such as Theocritus, Moschus, and Bion. Third, as Gow pointed out with reference to the pattern poem *Syrinx*, *syringes* in Greek art prior to the 1st century BC are consistently depicted as rectangular in shape, not with reeds of varying length; this detail, found in both Virgil and Longus, must therefore have been original with Virgil and cannot possibly have been in Philetas or any early Hellenistic poet.¹⁷ Fourth and most importantly, as I argued in *The Pipes of Pan*, *Ecl.* 2 is thoroughly and exclusively oriented toward Theocritus as Virgil's literary model:¹⁸ in this eclogue more than any other, Virgil incorporates and tropes motifs from every bucolic idyll of his predecessor and attempts to establish his own position as an original poet coming to terms with that predecessor's influence. In this context, it would only be a distraction for such an important programmatic passage as *Ecl.* 2.31–39 to be drawn from a different Greek poet, but quite appropriate if the metaphor were Virgil's inven-

¹⁶ Du Quesnay (1979) 60; cf. Bowie (1985) 81–83 for the same conclusions as Du Quesnay about Philetas as a common source: "that Longus used Virgil is hard to credit". Valley (1926) 90, noted the similarity of 1.29 to *Ecl.* 2.36–39, but not of 2.34–37, which as we have seen, is the more pregnant passage in terms of literary resonance. Thomas (1992) 36–44 also notes a series of close parallels between Philetas' entrance in 2.3 and Virgil's description of the Corycian gardener in *G.* 4.116–148, but like Du Quesnay and Bowie believes a common source in the poetry of Philetas must be behind both passages.

¹⁷ Gow (1952) vol. 2, 554.

¹⁸ Hubbard (1998) 54–68.

tion to express his ambiguous position (= Corydon's) as a literary heir of Theocritus (= Damoetas) in an uncertain quest for his own literary heir (= Alexis). Finally, it would be too obvious to the point of artlessness if Longus were to put into the mouth of a character named Philetas a metaphor drawn from the poet Philetas; Philetas is a credible name for a character in the novel precisely insofar as the historical poet Philetas/Philitas of Cos remained a somewhat shadowy figure, vaguely known as a distant influence on the tradition, but not in fact read very widely in Longus' time.

There are a number of other passages in *Daphnis and Chloe* that also suggest specific knowledge of Virgil's *Eclogues*. As he expounds the powers of the god Eros, Philetas describes to Daphnis and Chloe his own youthful love for Amaryllis (2.7). This is of course the name of the beloved addressed in Theocritus, *Id.* 3, and the passage is replete with references to that poem and to *Id.* 11.¹⁹ But most interesting is the line in which he praises the nymph Echo for calling out the name of Amaryllis after him (ἐπῆνουν τὴν Ἥχῳ τὸ Ἀμαρυλλίδος ὄνομα μετ' ἐμὲ καλοῦσαν, "I praised Echo for calling out the name of Amaryllis after me"). We do not find the Echo in Theocritus, but it is prominent in connection with the name of Amaryllis in a conspicuous passage at the opening of Virgil's *Eclogues* (*Ecl.* 1.4–5 *tu, Tityre, lentus in umbra / formonsam resonare doces Amaryllida silvas*, "you, Tityrus, relaxing in the shade teach the woods to echo the name of pretty Amaryllis").²⁰ Whereas Theocritus displays a direct address to Amaryllis in *Id.* 3, Longus, like Virgil, constructs Amaryllis as the paradigmatic beloved of an authoritative shepherd who tells others about his pastoral life. That Amaryllis is "echoed" sets up an expectation that this paradigm of pastoral love will itself become an object of literary imitation by other poets who "echo" the songs of Philetas or Tityrus: as we have seen, Philetas explicitly invests Daphnis as a successor, and inasmuch as Tityrus is emblematic for Virgilian pastoral, he can also be seen as a paradigm for later imitators.

Similarly, the intentional vandalism perpetrated by the envious Lampris on the flower garden of Lampon in 4.7.2–3 has no precedent in

¹⁹ For the Theocritean allusions here, see Valley (1926) 80–81, and Schönberger (1989) 191.

²⁰ This parallel was noted as early as Leo (1903) 3 n. 1, and Valley (1926) 90. Bowie (1985) 81, also acknowledges the closeness of the parallel, but insists on Philetas as the common source. While this is not impossible, the programmatic prominence of the first five lines of Virgil's *Eclogues* form a ready target for imitation by authors who are even remotely familiar with it.

Greek bucolic, but does have a model in the intentional destruction of grapevines alleged in *Ecl.* 3.10–11 or the contemplated destruction of flowers and springs in *Ecl.* 2.58–59.²¹ The Orphic powers imputed to pastoral song in more than one passage of *Daphnis and Chloe* (1.29–30, 4.15) do not have a good precedent in Theocritus, but are clearly evoked in Virgil's description of Silenus' song (*Ecl.* 6.27–30).

In the contest between Daphnis and Dorcon in 1.16.4, Dorcon praises himself for a fair complexion, but Daphnis defends his swarthy complexion by declaring dark hyacinths preferable to white lilies:

ἀγένειός εἰμι, καὶ γὰρ ὁ Διόνυσος· μέλας, καὶ γὰρ ὁ ὑάκινθος· ἀλλὰ κρείττων καὶ ὁ Διόνυσος Σατύρων, ὁ ὑάκινθος κρίνεται.

I am beardless, but so is Dionysus; I am dark, but so is the hyacinth. However, Dionysus is greater than the Satyrs, and the hyacinth than lilies.

There is a Theocritean parallel for the hyacinth as a favorable comparandum to a tan complexion (*Id.* 10.26–29):

Βομβύκα χαρίεσσα, Σύραν καλέοντί τυ πάντες,
ἰσχράν, ἀλιόκαυστον, ἐγὼ δὲ μόνος μελίχλωρον.
καὶ τὸ Ἴον μέλαν ἐστί, καὶ ἅ γραπτὰ ὑάκινθος·
ἀλλ' ἔμπας ἐν τοῖς στεφάνοις τὰ πρῶτα λέγονται.

Lovely Bombyca, everyone calls you Syrian, thin, and sun-burned, but I alone call you honey-fresh. Even the violet and inscribed hyacinth are dark; but they are the first to be gathered among flowers.

But a much closer parallel is found in Virgil (*Ecl.* 2.15–18), where the hyacinths are specifically preferred to white flowers, and the two types of flowers are explicitly brought forward as comparanda for the complexions of two youths:

nonne Menalcan,
quamuis ille niger, quamuis tu candidus esses?
o formose puer, nimium ne crede colori:
alba ligustra cadunt, uaccinia nigra leguntur.

Wasn't it better to have Menalcas, although he is dark and you are white? Fair boy, don't rely on your complexion too much: pale privets fall to the ground, but dark hyacinths are plucked.

²¹ Alpers (1996) 332 suggests the latter passage as a source, where the devastation of the landscape that Corydon imagines himself as wishing is the work of a disappointed lover run amok.

While none of these parallels may be conclusive by itself, their cumulative totality does add up to a substantial case in favor of Longus' familiarity with Virgil.

Critics have resisted seeing Virgil as a source for Longus largely out of the dogmatic conviction, reaching as far back as Gibbon, that Greek authors, no matter how minor, never recognize Roman authors, no matter how major.²² However, thanks to the recent work of Bruno Rochette and J.N. Adams, we are now in a much better position to assess the extent of bilingualism in the Greek parts of the Roman empire during this period.²³ There is no question but that Greek historians who wrote concerning Roman affairs, such as Polybius, Appian, Dio Cassius, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, or Diodorus Siculus, knew Latin well and read Roman historical sources.²⁴ Even an author with as pure an Atticist style as Appian saw no contradiction between his linguistic selectivity and making use of Latin sources where appropriate.²⁵ Familiarity with Latin and at least some Roman literature was surely also characteristic of most Greek intellectuals who were active in Italy. In the case of Philodemus, we actually have the remains of his library and know that it contained many Latin books; his fluency in Latin is confirmed by the epigram in which he reveals to us that he had an Italian girlfriend with no knowledge of Greek.²⁶ Plutarch (*Dem.*

²² Gibbon (1909) vol. 1, 38 n. 43: "there is not, I believe, from Dionysius to Libanius, a single Greek critic who mentions Virgil or Horace. They seem ignorant that the Romans had any good writers". Among critics treating the present question, see the similarly dismissive remarks of Du Quesnay (1979) 60, and Bowie (1985) 81.

²³ Rochette (1997), Adams, Janse and Swain (2002), Adams (2003). Somewhat earlier and much shorter, see also Holford-Strevens (1993) 203–213. Rochette's work puts more emphasis on bilingualism among the upper classes and educated elite, whereas Adams examines the abundant evidence across a range of social classes and functions, and does not limit his inquiry only to Greek and Latin.

²⁴ For Polybius, see Dubuisson (1985). Appian advertises his knowledge of Latin sources in *BCiv.* 2.70, 2.79, 4.12, and 5.45; see Hering (1935) and Famerie (1998). Dio Cassius held a series of high political offices in the Roman state that would be unthinkable if he did not know Latin well: for his likely use of both Livy and Tacitus, see Rochette (1997) 246–247, 279–280. For linguistic arguments that his Greek was influenced by Latin, see Frischer *et al.* (1999) 357–390. Dion. Hal. *AR* 1.7.2, made his use of Latin sources explicit; see Marin (1969) 595–607, and Rochette (1997) 231–233. Diod. Sic. 1.4 attests his knowledge of Latin: see Rochette (1997) 231. Strabo 4.1.1 quoted the *Commentarii* of Caesar; see Rochette (1997) 234, for other passages where he alludes to Latin authors. On the Greek historians' use of Latin sources generally, see Reichmann (1943) 3–6 and Dubuisson (1979) 89–106.

²⁵ See Famerie (1998) 213–239, for Appian's Atticism.

²⁶ Philodemus, *AP* 5.132 = *GPh* 3228ff. For the contents of his library, see the cata-

2–3) apologizes for not knowing Latin better and tells us that he knew enough Latin to read the orations of Cicero, but he did not feel confident enough in his Latin to judge the relative merit of Cicero's and Demosthenes' style.²⁷ However, the apologetic tone of this passage in itself implies that a Greek audience of this time would normally expect an author treating Roman affairs to know Latin well, and Plutarch elsewhere says (*Quaest. Plat.* 1010d) that most people know Latin. Particularly instructive for our purposes is a passage of Aulus Gellius (*NA* 19.9.7) describing a conversation with several learned Greeks, who spoke disparagingly of Roman literature in general, but made an exception for several verses of Catullus and Calvus; the Greeks reveal that they have also read Laevius, Hortensius, Cinna, and Memmius.²⁸ The conclusion we may be justified in drawing from this text is that no matter how proud Greeks were of their own literary tradition and no matter how convinced of its superiority, many of them did in fact read Latin literature and some had read quite a bit of it. Plutarch (*Quaest. symp.* 726e–727a) records a similar conversation of Greek intellectuals discussing Latin etymologies. Indeed, one is justified in wondering how much the deprecation of Roman culture was really sincere conviction and how much was a rhetorical strategy for asserting a distinctive Greek identity against the overwhelming political and military hegemony of the Roman state.²⁹

logue of Gigante (1979), which lists approximately 55 of the 1826 papyri as Latin. The most familiar of the Latin papyri is the poem *De bello Actiaco* (for text and commentary, see *FLP* pp. 334–340), but Kleve (1989), (1990), (1994), and (2001) discusses some of the others, among which he identifies fragments of Lucretius, Ennius, and Caecilius Statius.

²⁷ He admits here that he was late in his study of Latin literature; see *Cato* 7 for a similar refusal to judge Cato's style. *Lucullus* 39.5 translates a bit of Horace, and he elsewhere may show knowledge of Caesar, Sallust, Livy, and Varro; see Vornefeld (1901) and Hartman (1906) 307–316, for a complete survey of the passages. Most important for our purpose is that these passages prove that Plutarch had in fact read some authors in Latin. For his likely familiarity with the works of Tacitus, see Reichmann (1943) 5, 11. Pelling (1979) 75 minimizes Plutarch's familiarity with Latin literature by pointing to the many poets whose relevant work he does not cite, but such an *argumentum ex silentio* may not be the best guide.

²⁸ Moreover, as Adams (2003) 16–17 points out, the passage also reveals that the Greeks knew Latin well enough that they could detect a Spanish accent and ridicule it.

²⁹ Swain (1996) 39–42, emphasizes that the Atticists' insistence on purifying the Greek language of Latin contaminants did not mean they were unfamiliar with the Latin language or literature, so much as that they wished to reassert the claims of Greek literature to being the earliest and best.

Rochette lists no fewer than 54 Greek intellectuals earlier than 212 AD of whom it can be said with some certainty that they read Latin authors; in addition to those I have named he includes even the pure Atticist Lucian of Samosata.³⁰ After 212, he argues that the knowledge of Latin in Greek parts of the empire became even more widespread, as starting with the Severans there is ample evidence for the teaching of Latin in Greek schools; indeed, a statue of Virgil was erected in the gymnasium of Byzantium during the reign of Septimius Severus.³¹ Virgil and Cicero appear to have been the two authors most widely taught in Greek schools, and somewhat later, from the 4th century, we possess papyrus fragments of what appear to be Latin-Greek lexica to the works of Virgil. 18 papyri of Virgil's text have been found in Egypt, Syria, and Palestine, suggesting his popularity even in provinces where Greek was the dominant cultural language; one may be first-century in date, and two others as early as 2nd–3rd century AD.³² However, Greek interest in reading Virgil is attested even earlier: Seneca (*Cons. Polyb.* 8.2, 10.5) mentions a freedman of Claudius who translated Virgil's works into Greek. The *Suda* (α 3867 Adler) mentions an epic poet named Arrian, probably of Severan date,³³ who translated the *Georgics* into Greek. It seems likely that the *Eclogues* were also translated into Greek at an early date, particularly given the interpretation of *Ecl.* 4 as a Christian prophecy; we in fact have a Greek verse translation of this eclogue extant as part of Eusebius' translation of an oration of the emperor Constantine, who takes the Christian interpretation for granted.³⁴ That the *Eclogues* were read and imitated by Greek poets even at a much earlier date is proven by the clear echo of *Ecl.*

³⁰ Rochette (1997) 211–247, especially 243–244 with reference to Lucian. In *Pro lapsu inter salutandum* 13, he admits knowing Latin, despite the seemingly anti-Roman tendency of some other works. Indeed, the attack on Rome in the *Nigrinus* has itself been thought to be modelled on Juvenal. See Mesk (1912) 373–382, and (1913) 1–33. On Lucian's relation to Rome and Latin more generally, see also Reichmann (1943) 12–14 and Dubuisson (1984–1986) 185–207.

³¹ Rochette (1997) 167–210. For Virgil's statue, see Christodorus of Thebes, *AP* 2.414–416; Rochette (1997) 274–278.

³² The papyri are conveniently catalogued and dated in Pack (1965) 146–147. For detailed discussions of specific papyri, see Reichmann (1943) 28–57, Rochette (1997) 188–198, and Baldwin (1976) 361–368. On Virgil's popularity in the Greek world throughout this period, see also Irmscher (1985) 281–285.

³³ See Swain (1991) 211–214.

³⁴ On this translation, see Reichmann (1943) 58–61, Rochette (1997) 276–279, and Wigil (1981) 336–341.

7.3–4 (*Thyrsis ... Corydon ... / ambo florentes aetatibus, Arcades ambo*) in an epigram of Erycius, likely to have been a contemporary of Virgil (*AP* 6.96.1–2 Γλαύκων καὶ Κορύδων οἱ ἐν οὔρεσι βουκολέοντες, / Ἀρκάδες ἀμφοτέροι).³⁵ Numerous scholars have argued that Quintus of Smyrna and Triphiodorus used Virgil in their work;³⁶ closer to our genre and period, Quintino Cataudella argued that Chariton was familiar with *Aeneid* 4.³⁷ Clearly, there was a steady and gradual growth in the knowledge of literary Latin throughout Greek parts of the empire from the earliest days of the principate.

When one considers all these factors, the resistance to seeing Virgil as a possible source and inspiration for Longus must surely melt away. It bears noting that Longus in fact had a Roman name.³⁸ Moreover,

³⁵ For Erycius' date and likely place of origin, see *GPh* vol. 2, 278–279. Gow and Page hesitate to accept the possibility of Virgilian imitation here, thinking that “the coincidence may be fortuitous” or that Virgil imitated Erycius. But, as Bowie (1985) 82–83 correctly saw, the parallel is simply too good to be an accident, and Virgil cannot be imitating Erycius, for this line preserves the metaphor of Arcadia, elsewhere so central to Virgil's pastoral conception, and Virgil's decision to locate his pastoral world there can hardly have come out of imitation of a single line in an epigrammatist who elsewhere makes nothing of the idea. However, Bowie's own insistence that the line came out of Philetas as a common source (see also Reitzenstein (1893) 131–132 n. 2) also seems to be a stretch: if Philetas had placed the pastoral world in Arcadia and were such an important precursor of pastoral poetry, why do neither Theocritus nor any of the other Greek bucolic poets make any mention of Arcadia? As Gow and Page note in view of the Roman name, “the epigrammatist was presumably a Greek who had acquired Roman citizenship and adopted his patron's family name”. If so, his familiarity with Latin and Rome seem likely; *AP* 7.230 is an attack on the literary critic Parthenius, suggesting his intimate involvement in the literary politics of early Augustan Rome. In favor of Erycius as the imitator of Virgil, see von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1906) 111 n. 1, and the more detailed argument of E. Norden in Cichorius (1922) 306. See also Reichmann (1943) 9. Williams (1978) 124–134 contextualizes this case among several other examples of Greek epigram exhibiting the influence of Roman poetry.

³⁶ For Quintus, see Becker (1913) 68–90, Keydell (1954) 254–256, and (1963) 1286–1291; Rochette (1997) 264–265 n. 22 for further bibliography. For Triphiodorus, who is in virtue of recent papyrological evidence now generally dated to the late 3rd century (cf. *POxy.* 2946, and Fornaro (2002) 825–826; for metrical and stylistic grounds, cf. Alan Cameron (1970) 478–482), after Noack (1892) 452–463, Castiglioni (1926) 501–517, Funaioli (1939) 1–7. See D'Ippolito (1976) 9–12, and Rochette (1997) 265 n. 23, for further bibliography.

³⁷ Cataudella (1927) 302–312. His case is less than probative.

³⁸ Apollonius of Tyana, *Epist.* 71 Penella, complains to the Ionians of their tendency to give up their Greek heritage by adopting Roman names; see also Philostratus, *VA* 4.5. The same point is made from a Roman perspective by Martial 6.17. The practice was far from rare and surely attests a high esteem for Rome as well as an ambition to excel within the Roman provincial administration.

epigraphic evidence attests a prominent family of that name in Mytilene from the 1st century BC, when a Cn. Pompeius Longus is recorded.³⁹ It seems likely from the novel's Lesbian setting and intimate knowledge of Lesbian topography that the author was indeed from the island;⁴⁰ that the Mytileneans are presented as good and the Methymnians as bad confirms his identity as a Mytilenean. If our Longus was indeed a descendant of this distinguished Greco-Roman family, with its long record of service to the Roman state, can we really believe that he would have received no schooling in Latin or would have been so insular in his preference for things Greek that he would have despised an author like Virgil as unworthy of his notice? The mere fact that Longus' family chose to Romanize its name suggests Roman citizenship or ambitions within the Roman provincial administration, both of which make it likely that the family would educate its children in Latin and that its orientation would be philo-Roman rather than contemptuous of Roman culture. Michael Reeve has even detected traces of familiarity with Latin in Longus' Greek.⁴¹ Even if Longus did not know Latin, Greek translations of Virgil's works apparently did exist in his time.

It is of course impossible to disprove the existence of the archetypal "lost common source" that scholars are so fond of positing. However, given Virgil's prominence and the likelihood that Longus would have either known Latin or had access to Greek translations of Virgil, as well as the multiple passages in Longus' novel that appear to reveal fairly precise knowledge of Virgil's text, it seems quite gratuitous to speculate about such a hypothetical lost source. We should certainly not insist, as Ewen Bowie has done, on reconstructing Philetas as a pastoral poet largely based on the hypothesized need for a non-Virgilian source to the parallel passages in question.⁴² Even as Daphnis

³⁹ See Cichorius (1922) 321–323, and Hunter (1983a) 2, for more detail on this family, although they are probably wrong in relating the consul of 49 AD to the same family; see Syme (1979–1991) vol. 2, 821 n. 1; vol. 4, 347 n. 3; vol. 6, 223, where his *nomen* is recorded as "Longinus".

⁴⁰ See Mason (1979) 149–163, Green (1982) 210–214, Hunter (1983a) 2–3, Bowie (1985) 86–91. For a denial of specificity to Longus' Lesbian topography, see Scarcella (1968).

⁴¹ Reeve (1982) 90, suggests that the expression *vũv ... vũv ...* in 1.13.6 is unfamiliar in Greek and probably reflects the common Latin *modo ... modo ...*.

⁴² Bowie (1985) 81–83.

and Chloe themselves turn out to have a parentage different from what was expected, one external and foreign to their environment, the same may be true of the novel *Daphnis and Chloe*.⁴³

⁴³ The author acknowledges with thanks the help of Richard Hunter, Michael Reeve, Glen Bowersock, J.N. Adams, Tomas Hägg, David Armstrong, and Ewen Bowie on various aspects of this paper, as well as the comments of the audience members at the conference on “Pastoral Texts and Contexts” in Oslo in April 2003 and subsequently at the meeting of the American Philological Association in Boston in January 2005. No one but the author himself should be held responsible for the conclusions presented here.

THE DRAMA OF PASTORAL IN NONNUS AND COLLUTHUS

BYRON HARRIES

The Alexandrian credentials of Nonnian poetics are now widely understood and systematically annotated.¹ Subtle interfusion and, to challenge the learned reader's sense of propriety, the crude juxtaposition of familiar generic motifs are therefore appreciated as integral components, shaping and qualifying the narrative's irregular progress towards a vindication of the god's supremacy and triumph, whether of Dionysus in the one poem or of Christ² in the other. Any judgement that the *Dionysiaca* is exceptional among imperial Greek hexameter poems in this respect would be premature in view of the almost total loss of (possibly) comparable epics by Dionysius, Pisander and Pamprepicus;³ it can also, more significantly for modern readers, be confidently rejected as sophisticated Hellenistic devices of allusion, structural innovation and generic deployment are increasingly recognised features in the compositional techniques of Quintus of Smyrna, Triphiodorus and the Oppianic poems.⁴ In neither of his poems is Nonnus' skill inferior to that of these recent predecessors, but in its use of Alexandrian pastoral motifs the *Dionysiaca* finds a dynamic and complex role for the inherited methodology in plotting the trajectory of the narrative.

Mere allusion to hackneyed pastoral contexts and characters through suggestive words and situations may at first seem little more than a foil to the unremitting violence of the action, especially to the uninhibited

¹ Not least because of the essays by Hopkinson and Hollis in Hopkinson (1994), 9–42 and 43–62 respectively. To these may now be added the very stimulating contribution by Shorrock (2001).

² Thematic parallels between the *Dionysiaca* and the Johannine Paraphrasis, extensively explored in recent commentaries, still await a full critical appreciation and evaluation. I restrict myself here to discussing only the former.

³ For the first two see Whitby (1994) 123–126, with 148 n. 228 on Pamprepicus.

⁴ Most especially and innovatively in the *Halieutica*, an assessment I propose to develop elsewhere. For current views on the dating and general character of these poets see Whitby (1994) 108–122 and Dubielzig (1996) 1–34.

intensity of the passions accompanying it. The simple antithesis, potentially even comical in effect,⁵ is in itself initially disarming. To evoke the charms and playful deceptions of an Arcadian pastoral scene, whose main source of tension is the uncertain outcome of a singing-match, achieves the immediate and superficial effect of distancing us from the poem's incessant restlessness and anxiety, and of countering more disturbing implications with a reassurance that innocent simplicity is still an accessible refuge. This fits well with a widely accepted understanding of literary allusion as qualifying the sharpness of our sensory responses by contextualising them in a distant literary perspective, while also in certain cases simultaneously intensifying the reader's disquiet by recalling ominous and unwelcome parallels or antitypes. The restricted repertoire of pastoral themes and vocabulary would therefore seem to be relatively as uncomplicating as they are easily recognized. Repeated use of them in the poetic fabric of the *Dionysiaca* would risk tedium and progressive diminution of their impact, fatal to a poem whose dynamic momentum is driving towards an all-embracing poetic equivalent for the amatory and territorial ambitions of Dionysus himself.⁶ The challenge Nonnus accepted was to incorporate Pastoral as a dynamic agent in this momentum, first by deploying familiar motifs in those sections of the earlier books where intensity of passion and extremes of violence are depicted most explicitly. The allusions themselves evoke the resonant music of the pastoral world, whose melodious instruments perform in these sections the function they serve when first heard in the second half of the opening book. From this starting-point, the conspicuous character of Pastoral, recollected and manipulated through allusion, is worked into the dramatic narrative of the poem as an active participant, to experience conflict, momentary triumph, eventual humiliation and, like other victims of this god's voracious appetite, final absorption into the insatiable Dionysiac universe.

⁵ The latent comedy in the military/pastoral antithesis unexpectedly surfaces, for example, in the jarring verbal associations found in the confrontation between Hector and the shepherd-messenger in Eurip. (?), *Rhes.* 264–274.

⁶ A comparison between the literary association of ποιυιλία, 'variety' and the character of Dionysus, 'un dieu aux aspects et aux contrasts multiples', is suggested in Vian's brief but interesting discussion of the term, (1976) 9–10.

1. *The Cadmus episode (1.321–2.68)*

The gigantomachy rages through most of the first and second books, as weapons fly high and low, far and wide, north and south, whole mountains are uprooted, and the seas reach the peak of Olympus. Typhon has threatened to alter the course of the whole poem by stealing Zeus' thunderbolts (1.155) and leaving nature's chief protector helpless, or at least armed only with his aegis (1.381). It would not be exactly true to claim that Pastoral is now invoked to do battle with the excesses of an epic gigantomachy, since the combative image hardly does justice to what is, rather, a subtle infusion of pastoral detail which effectively neutralises the raging giant at his most intimidating.⁷ Zeus' plan to recover the thunderbolts by stealth involves getting Cadmus to dress up as a conventional pastoral figure, attract Typhon's attention with the music of the pipes, and open the way for Zeus to creep into the cave where the thunderbolts are hidden (1.387–407). The success of this plan enables the second half of the battle, which fills the second book, to end more conventionally than would otherwise have been the case. In the resulting structure, then, these two long episodes of mind-boggling violence and unnatural devastation (1.145–320 and 2.22–659), in which heaven, earth, and sea are transformed into a single, spectacular theatre of war, enclose a pastoral idyll, whose conventional trappings take on an unusual significance in that so much depends (for salvaging the narrative) on their being effectively deployed and our being able to identify them correctly.

Cadmus' disguise is designed to have an effect which is parallel to, but by no means the same as, that of the disguise which Zeus is still using (1.408) after his adventures with Europa and which he had laid aside at 1.344–345 to have intercourse with her. The confusion of identities is made worse by Typhon himself, who aspires to become a Ζεὺς νόθος, "a bastard Zeus" (1.295) at a time when Zeus is masquerading as an ὑδροπόρος βοῦς, "seafaring bull" (1.322). Nor is it only characters' names that are denied straightforward recognition. An imprecision in poetic vocabulary, suggesting only a general sphere of reference rather

⁷ Not that Zeus quite seems to understand the kind of struggle Cadmus is engaged in (at 1.383–387 he presents the issue at stake solely in terms of his personal role in the future history of Greek mythology!). The limitations of the god's understanding are exposed as he tries to urge Cadmus on in the traditional language of military combat (1.400–404).

than a sharply delineated picture, contributes to the overall impression, while still remaining part of a deliberate strategy. First, two features of the vocabulary repay analysis.

In his pastoral disguise, Cadmus is termed νομεύς (1.373, 412, 505, 2.21), ποιμήν (1.424, 463, 513, 521),⁸ αἰπόλος (1.427, 474, 2.3), βουκόλος (1.444, 460, 478, 2.9), βοτήρ (1.376), and βούτης (1.387); he is said to keep sheep at 1.447, goats at 1.449, and cattle at 1.453. These terms are sufficiently flexible for there to be no real crisis of identity here,⁹ but such apparently indiscriminate usage hardly strengthens the reader's confidence in the clarity of the poet's perception. The pattern recurs with the instrument which Cadmus is playing, a "shepherd's pipe": it is generally termed σῦριγξ (1.374, 394, 418, 429, 447, 467, 486, 522, 2.2), but we also find it referred to as πηκτίς (1.389, 431, 434, 444, 2.19) and αὐλός (1.466) as well as in the more general terms δόναξ/δόνακες (1.410, 435, 484, 518, 2.21; cf. 1.440) and κάλαμοι (1.430). These two latter terms, which seem originally to have referred to reeds used in the mouthpiece of the *aulos*,¹⁰ have a wider application to different kinds of reed instrument,¹¹ but the *syrix* and *aulos* are commonly distinguished,¹² while the use of *pektis* in its secondary and later meaning of 'shepherd's pipe' serves only to distort the musical picture further.¹³ This kind of impre-

⁸ The metaphorical application of ποιμήν to Eros at 1.400 (βίου φιλοτήσιε ποιμήν, "friendly shepherd of life") is best explained by reference to ποιμήν Ἔρως in Longus 4.39.2. See Hunter (1983a) 36–37 for background and discussion.

⁹ Their flexibility could hardly be better illustrated than in a line of Cratinus, ποιμήν καθέστη· αἰπολῶ καὶ βουκολῶ, "I am a shepherd; I herd goats and cows" (*PCG* 313), with its full context in Dio Chrys. 56.2 (2.155 de Budé). See further Dover (1971) liv–lv.

¹⁰ See Barker (1984) 1.58 n. 13 and Σ Pindar, *Pyth.* 12.44a (vol. 2, 268–269 Drachmann).

¹¹ For *donax* in pastoral contexts, see *APlan.* 226.2 ποιεμένη ... δόνακι by Alcaeus of Messene (= *HE* 129) and 231.2 ἀδυβόα ... δόνακι by Anyte (= *HE* 739). The association goes back to the *donax* of the herdsman Argus at [Aesch.] *PV* 574. A possible distinction between *donax* and *aulos* is suggested by Gow on [Theocr.] 20.29 and is in Himerius 54.1 (215 Colonna) αὐλοῖς ἐπηχῶν ἢ δόναξι, "resounding with *auloi* and *donaxes*". For the musical use of *kalamos*, see LSJ s.v. II.1; at [Mosch.] *Ep.Bion.* 51–54 it seems to be used as a synonym for *donax* and *syrix*.

¹² See West (1992) 81–105 for the double *auloi* and 109–112 for the *syrix*, and also Willink (1986) on Eur. *Or.* 145–146. The special associations between the cult of Dionysus and the *aulos* can be observed as early as the 6th century, when Pratinus of Phlius wrote a protest-poem (*TrGF* 1, pp. 81–82) against the innovative rhythms and playing-techniques of the god's *aulos*-players. See West (1992) 323–324.

¹³ For this sense of *pektis*, see West (1997) 53–54, who like Vian (1990) 279–280 asserts that Nonnus only knows *pektis* as a woodwind instrument. Despite the problem this creates for the interpretation of 7.48–54, I have adopted their position here (though Vian wrongly persists in glossing both *pektis* and *aulos* as 'flûte' when something resem-

cision is typical of the hazy picture Nonnus' language is constructing, and these (and other) examples will recur throughout the poem. Clarity of perception, which depends on a prior clarity of definition, is not the aim, since Nonnus is trying to evoke as broad a spectrum of the pastoral world as he can, bringing a whole repertory of pastoral stage-parts to work (remember that Cadmus is dressed in εἴμασι μιμηλοῖσι, "counterfeit garments", 1.373) in order to attain the desired effect, along with an assorted company of pastoral instruments. The aim is an impressionistic one, to invoke the full force of pastoral music, with every traditional performer and instrument available, in a captivating enthrallment of the gigantic savagery which not even Zeus can tame.

And to what end? The aims are defined clearly enough: δόλος and θέλξις, "deception" and "enchantment". Pastoral music already has the power to enchant and bewitch in several Theocritean contexts,¹⁴ as when the *syrinx*-playing of the *boutes* Daphnis makes the calves prance on the meadow (6.43–45), or the playing of a *boukolos* on *syrinx*, *aulos*, or *donax* makes the girls rush up to kiss him (20.28–31).¹⁵

Another example occurs in an epigram attributed to Theocritus, *AP* 9.433 = *HE* 3492–3495:

Λῆς ποτὶ τᾶν Νυμφᾶν διδύμοις αὐλοῖσιν αἰεῖσαι
 ἄδύ τί μοι; κῆγὼ πακτίδ' αἰεράμενος
 ἄρξεῦμαί τι κρέκνειν, ὃ δὲ βουκόλος ἄμμιγα θέλξει
 Δάφνης κηροδέτῳ πνεύματι μελόμενος.

By the Nymphs, would you like to play some sweet music for me on the double *aulos*? I too shall take the *pektis* and begin to make music, while the ox-herd Daphnis will enchant us with music from the breath of his wax-bedded reeds".

bling an oboe is clearly intended). Many contexts in the *Dionysiaca* obviously demand a woodwind instrument rather than a lyre. In a few ambiguous contexts we need confirmatory support from contemporary literary usage, and this is scanty. Hesychius, possibly an Alexandrian contemporary of Nonnus, glosses *pektis* as both *syrinx* and ψαλτήριον, "psaltery" (π 2171 Schmidt), though only the latter sense has been recognised in the authorities quoted by Athen. 634c–637a. West (1997) 53 detects the origin of the woodwind designation in Theocritean vocabulary, and draws attention to its use in the anonymous *Fragmentum Vindobonense* in Gow, *Bucolici Graeci* 168–170, ll. 11 and 63.

¹⁴ See, e.g., Gutzwiller, this volume, pp. 12–16.

¹⁵ Hubbard (1998) 20–21 singles out the "primary emphasis on song and its powers" as a central feature of Theocritean bucolics, but is mainly concerned to read this as a paratextual allusion to the transmission and interpretation of inherited literary models in the verse. Despite his title, Hubbard has surprisingly little to say of the instruments themselves and their potential for entrapment as well as enchantment.

Here the instrumental trio comprises *syrix*,¹⁶ *aulos* with two pipes,¹⁷ and *pektis* again, which Gow is probably right to take as “lyre”.¹⁸ The crucial word in the epigram is, however, θέλξει—the effect of pastoral music is to enchant, and in the context of the first book of the *Dionysiaca* the enchantment must be powerful enough to overwhelm the forces of disorder, violence, and chaos. So, at 1.394–395 Zeus instructs Cadmus:

κερδαλέης σύριγγος ἀλεξικάκῃ σέο μολπῇ
θέλγε νόον Τυφῶνος

enchant Typhon’s mind with your crafty pipe’s evil-dispelling song.

His pastoral music is to be θελγόμενον / ... βέλος, his “charmed shot” (404–405), creating a φρενοθελγέος οἶστρον αἰοιδῆς, “agony of sense-beguiling sound” (1.406). So successful is the effect that at 1.521–524 we have Cadmus sitting alongside Typhon, who is now totally bewitched (θελγομένῳ, 521; cf. 533–534), singing of the imminent destruction of Typhon himself to the uncomprehending giant. The effect is most fully portrayed in two similes which (a rare occurrence in the *Dionysiaca*) are placed in close proximity to each other: at 1.525–534 it is the bewitching power of sexual attraction which grips the (male) victim just as the soft (feminine) breath of the pipes entrances the savage giant, while at 2.11–19 the reference to the beguiling song of the Sirens in *Odyssey* 12 prepares us for the fatal outcome: enchantment can prove to be a trap for the sailor, the giant, and the reader alike.¹⁹ In this simile it is the sailor who is “bewitched” by the magical music (θελγόμενος μελέεσσι, 2.13), but the link between enchantment and destruction is more in evidence here as the sailor falls λιγυφθόγγοιο ... ἐπὶ δίκτυα Μοίρης, “upon the nets of clear-voiced Fate” (2.15),²⁰ and the giant duly succumbs to

¹⁶ See Gow’s note on l. 4.

¹⁷ Like that at 10.234. See further Chrétien (1985) 146 *ad loc.* and Bühler (1960) 144 on Mosch. *Eur.* 97–98. For the relation of the two pipes see West (1992) 103–105.

¹⁸ So also West (1997) 51. κρέκειν (3) is unhelpful since it can be used of both plucked and blown sounds. Cf. the examples with *kithara*, *aulos*, and *donax* in LSJ s.v. κρέκω 2. There is, however, no certain example of *pektis* as a wind instrument before the Imperial era (see above n. 13).

¹⁹ On the similes see Hopkinson (1994) 19–20. For *Odyssey* 12 as a source here and the rich collection of epic detail in the passage as a whole see Vian (1976) 164. In earlier pastoral contexts, e.g. Euripides (?), *Rhes.* 551–555, musical enchantment (θέλγει, 554) often induces sleep. Seaford (1984) 106, on the Parodos of *Cyclops*, contributes nothing relevant here.

²⁰ We tend to think of the image as Aeschylean (Petrounias (1976) 185–186), but Nonnus would have found it in more recent poems as well, as Vian (1976) illustrates in his note on 1.483.

the *πηκτίδος ἡδὺ βέλεμον ... πομπὸν ὀλέθρου*, “sweet dart from his pipes, his escort to death” (2.19). This theme, that the apparently innocent world of pastoral enchantment has a sinister, ominous potential for destruction, will be developed later in the poem.

The destructive potential of pastoral music is already foreshadowed in the emphasis we find in 1.408–464 on the deceptive nature of melody. If Cadmus deceives in more than one way (he is a “bastard herdsman”: νόθος νομεύς 1.373, νόθος ποιμήν 1.521, and νόθος αἰπόλος 2.3), his pipes deceive in another, and Nonnus exploits the senses of *θέλγειν* already abundantly represented in Homer, where it can be the verb used for Circe and the Sirens (*Od.* 10.291, 326, 12.40), while in a different sense Achilles can refer to his mother as one *ἣ με ψεύδεσσιν ἔθελγεν* “who deluded me with her lies” (*Il.* 21.276), or can imagine he is chasing Agenor, *δόλῳ δ’ ἄρ’ ἔθελγεν Ἀπόλλων* “Apollo deluded him with a trick” (*Il.* 21.604). Cadmus’ pipe is already a *δολίη σὺριγξ*, “deceitful pipe” (1.374) producing an *ἀπατήλιον ἡχώ*, “deceitful sound” (1.410), a *δολοπλόκον ὕμνον*, “deluding tune” (1.413), a *δόλιον μέλος*, “delusive melody” (1.416), a *δόλον ... λυγύθοον*, “musical deception” (1.423). What must be emphasised, though, is that the idea of *dolos* here is not merely one of disguise and enchantment, a trick which blissfully, but momentarily, beguiles mortals out of their wits. To see the deception only in these terms would be to take the pastoral disguise as effectively equivalent to the amatory disguises already adopted earlier in the book; for both kinds aim at inducing compliance and submission through mimesis and deceptive illusion, and they both share a common vocabulary which consolidates their association in the reader’s mind. Poseidon, for example, has earlier approached Tyro disguised as the νόθος Ἐνιπεύς, “bastard Enipeus” which bubbled with *χεύμασι μιμηλοῖσι*, “counterfeit waters” (1.124), just as Cadmus becomes a νόθος νομεύς, “bastard herdsman” with *εἵμασι μιμηλοῖσι*, “counterfeit garments” (1.373); the impact of Cadmus’ art is directly compared in the closing simile (1.525–534) to the effect of erotic infatuation on a young man: just as Cadmus bewitched Typhon’s wits (cf. *θελγομένην*, “enchanted”, 1.534), so the youth is bewitched as he gazes helplessly on the girl he adores (1.532; cf. 1.526):

ἀμφὶ δὲ μορφῇ
θέλγεται ἀλλοπρόσαλλον ἄγων ἀκόρητον ὀπωπὴν

he delights to draw his gaze over and over her beauty, never satisfied.

Also, at 1.406–407 Zeus himself compares Cadmus’ entrancing arts with his own earlier passion for Europa, when he mimicked a ἱμερόεν μύκημα νόθῳ ... λαμῶ, “charming bellow with his counterfeit throat” (1.47) and swam a νόθον πλόον, “bastard voyage” with her on his back (1.97). Such parallels are suggestive, but must not preclude our seeing an additional element in the Cadmus narrative. The *destructive* potential of the pastoral music, to be depicted in the Siren simile early in Book 2, is already present here, as Typhon offers his hand in greeting but remains “unaware of the net of destruction” (ἄρκυν ὀλέθρου / ἀγνώσσω, 1.424–425)²¹ which the pastoral music is weaving around him. And the effect of the music is to beguile the reader as well: for a moment we are no longer in the middle of a cosmic battle where mountain peaks can become guided missiles; rather, this is the evocative world of the Theocritean idyll. When Typhon confronts the understandably terrified Cadmus and promises not to hurt him (1.427 αἰδόλε, τί τρομέεις με; τί φάεα χειρὶ καλύπτεις; “goatherd, why do you fear me? why do you cover your eyes with your hand?”) we think of that other giant, whom Theocritus has confront the terrified Galatea with the disarming appeal τί τὸν φιλέοντ’ ἀποβάλλῃ, “why do you reject the one who loves you?” (*Id.* 11.19), while at 1.439–443 Typhon proposes setting up a musical “contest” (φιλὴν ἔρις, 1.439) between himself and Cadmus, the model for which is evidently a bucolic singing match like that between Comatas and Lacon in *Id.* 5.²² For just as those Theocritean shepherds argue the case each for his own personal vantage-point (*Id.* 5.31–62),²³ so Nonnus’ Typhon intensifies his appeal by trying to turn the Olympian heights into a large pastoral theme park (1.444–464), offering all the incentives a Theocritean goatherd could desire, including at 1.474 even the goatskin aegis of Zeus.²⁴ In fact, at 2.660–695 Zeus will actually reward Cadmus with some of these heavenly delights.

²¹ The image is from hunting (see Garvie (1986) 328 with references), and follows the pattern I have already outlined for Nonnian word-variation by appearing in such phrases as λῖνον ἄρκης, “hunting net” (1.482) and δίχτυα Μοίρης, “net of Fate” (2.15) instead of ἄρκυν ὀλέθρου “net of destruction” (1.424) when it occurs elsewhere.

²² For the characteristics of these contests in pastoral poetry see Rosenmeyer (1969) 153–167. Their central role in the evolution of Bucolic is explained by Hunter (1999) 6–7.

²³ The significance of this feature of bucolic contests is stressed by Lawall (1967) 63, who concludes: ‘The refusal of each to cross over to the other emphasizes in graphic manner the unbridgeable gulf which separates the goatherd from the shepherd.’

²⁴ As often, Nonnus here exploits a traditional topos without observing conventional limitations. Typhon’s gifts are on an appropriately ludicrous scale (467–475):

An oasis of pastoral enchantment, then, in the harsh, cruel world surrounding it, playful, beguiling, the episode is our first exposure to the power of the melodious reeds, *syrinx*, *donax*, *pektis*, or whatever we would call them. Language here must be deliberately imprecise, as the whole effect is, after all, essentially an impressionistic one, robbing us of the *φρόνες*, “understanding” with which we can discriminate, as *φρενοθελγῆς αἰοιδή*, “mind-bewitching tune” (406) neatly confirms. The explicit depiction of violence which precedes the mock-idyll (and succeeds it, for at 2.61–62 Typhon becomes violent again, while Cadmus symbolically drops his *syrinx* and runs away) is vividly pointed with embarrassingly precise detail. The pastoral interlude offers, by contrast, a kind of *θελκτήριον*, “charm”, or *φάρμακον*, “philtre” for the sharply delineated and violently savage passions that surround it.²⁵ But all is not innocent even here. The emphasis on mimesis is closely tied in with the intention to deceive, so that laying the *ἄρκυν ὀλέθρου*, “net of destruction” (1.424) can become a valid aim of the pastoral exercise. Cadmus imitates a shepherd; the episode imitates Theocritus; if we readers are not deceived by the mimicry, we can for a moment feel superior to Typhon, who is.

2. *Actaeon and Ampelus*

The Cadmus episode established Pastoral as a major player in the tactical presentation of Nonnus’ theme, the universal extension of Dionysian power and influence. The effect of pastoral music, in particular, continues to be impressionistically conveyed by loose reference to a range of instruments, but it is typical of the omnifarious nature of this text that we simultaneously find these instruments (notably the *aulos*) performing their traditional functions outside an obviously pastoral context.²⁶ Already, at the beginning of Book 8, where Dionysus is

Rosenmeyer (1969) 163 points out in his discussion of gifts in eristic poems that as a rule ‘the presents must not be costly’. Similarly, the gifts which Polyphemus hopes will attract Galatea (Theocr. 11.34–41) are quite unspectacular and, ironically, uninviting.

²⁵ An obvious connection suggests itself with the function of song as a *φάρμακον* for passion in Theocr. 11.1–4. For the problems which arise there from treating poetic song in this way, see Goldhill (1991) 255–259, Hunter (1999) 220–221. In Nonnus too, any relief can only be temporary. A decisive success for Pastoral at this junction would bring premature closure to the narrative.

²⁶ Cf. 3.234–242 (shown by 240–242 to be Corybantic), 7.48–54, where the close

making his presence felt in the womb, we see how this apparent indifference to generic niceties momentarily anticipates the poem's climax. The infant is excited enough to compel Semele to react to the *syrix* of a ποιμήν, "shepherd" (8.14) or to the δίζυξ αὐλός, "double aulos" in the mountains (8.17), to echo the melody of Pan (8.25), and to drive itself and its mother to an αὐλομανὲς μίμημα, "mimicry of madness induced by the *aulos*" (8.29). But there are alien sounds in this pastoral harmony. The furious Corybantic κύμβαλα, "cymbals" also clash on these mountains, along with the roaring of bulls (8.20–23),²⁷ and the ivy which Semele weaves in her hair (8.9) turns out not to serve the requirements of a traditional pastoral picture but to be marking her out already as a Βασσαρίδων μάντις "prophetess of the Bassarids" (8.11).²⁸ The effect, then, seems to be not that Dionysus is coming under the influence of the pastoral music at a remarkably early stage, but rather the reverse. Already, the pastoral music and the Bacchic music, as in Euripides, are becoming the same thing.²⁹

A rural setting is not necessarily a pastoral one in any generically exclusive way. No traditional pastoral landscape, for example, would have room for a figure like Semele's brother Aristaeus, with his inventive and didactic skills. He not only invents his own hunting-techniques (5.229–241) and harnesses nature to produce honey and olive-oil (5.242–260), but he has to "teach" countrymen (cf. ἐδίδαξε, 5.262) how to look after their animals (5.261–267) and to play their panpipes (5.268), skills which seem to be acquired in the pastoral world as effortlessly as the fruit grows on the trees.³⁰ The Golden Age world of pastoral is characterised by simplicity and naivety,³¹ a very different background from that out of which Aristaeus and his son Actaeon emerge. The latter

proximity of φόρμιγξ (51) to *pektis* (52) strongly suggests the older sense of 'harp' for the latter, a possibility ignored by West (1997) 54.

²⁷ For the Corybantic *kymbala*, cf. Catull. 63.29, Juv. 9.62. Interestingly, Strabo 10.469 gives κυμβάλων as the reading in one of the fragments he quotes from Pindar's Second Dithyramb, where the Oxford papyrus has restored τυ[μ]πάνων (fr. 70b.9 Maehler) and a fuller Dionysian context. For the significance of the roaring of bulls see Dodds (1960) xviii and Roux (1972) on Eur. *Bacch.* 691, a line which Nonnus all but reproduces at 8.22.

²⁸ Hunter (1999) 78 suggests that Theocr. 1.29–31 already recalls the Bacchic ivy of *HHom.Dion.* 40–41.

²⁹ For the Euripidean blending of pastoral and Bacchic musical motifs see, for example, the first stasimon of *Bacchae* (ll. 370–432), with Segal (1982) 70–77.

³⁰ For the topos see K.F. Smith on Tibull. 1.3.45–46.

³¹ On the importance of this see Halperin (1983a) 42–49.

is not merely a hunter (an alien figure in traditional pastoral)³² but applies his father's skills to killing bears, lionesses, and panthers (5.288–296), animals which the pastoral scenery does not usually accommodate,³³ while a conventional figure like Pan looks on in amazement (5.297). Pan's amazement is also ours, as Nonnus here employs what will become the familiar device of introducing the savagery and strange menagerie of the hunter Dionysus into the idyllic setting of conventional pastoral.³⁴

The presentation of the Actaeon episode is extraordinary, for it is not just a straightforward narrative of metamorphosis followed by a pastoral lament. The vivid description—the most blood-curdling so far—of Actaeon being torn apart by dogs, who chew him still ἔμπροσθ, “alive” and κεκασμένον ἔμφρονι θυμῷ, “in full possession of his senses” (5.333), is complemented by a lament in two parts, both performed by Actaeon himself, the first while he is dying, the second by his *psyche* after death. The first (5.337–365), with its invitation to sing an αἶλινος for the dying youth (5.354), clearly invokes the opening of [Moschus]' *Epitaph for Bion*, and may be characterised as a funereal meditation rather than a narrative. The second (5.415–532) is spoken by Actaeon's *psyche* to his sleeping father, and the repeated imperative ἔγρεο, “wake up” which begins it (5.416–417), followed by κύσον ἔμφρονα θῆρα, “kiss an animal which has rational understanding” (5.418), picks up the line ἔγρεο τυτθόν, Ἄδωνι, τὸ δ' αὖ πύματόν με φίλησον, “wake for a moment, Adonis, and give me one final kiss”, from Bion's *Epitaph for Adonis* (l. 45).³⁵ The changing point of reference is significant, for Actaeon's second lament, like the poem to Bion but more so, is a reworking of the narrative of the infliction of the wound. Actaeon begins (5.473) with much incidental detail, omitted in the earlier version, of how he saw Artemis,

³² The contrast between hunting and herding in earlier Pastoral is explained by Rosenmeyer (1969) 135–137, who also shows how Theocr. 5.106–115 is consistent with his view that hunting normally has no place in the Theocritean landscape.

³³ ‘The green cabinet does not harbor hostile animals’, Rosenmeyer (1969) 135. If present, they shed their natural aggression (Theocr. 1.71–72).

³⁴ We shall find the same device employed in the episodes of Ampelus (Book 10) and Hymnus (Book 15).

³⁵ Chuvin (1976) omits the parallel, but notes (p. 187) that this poem has been a source for the intervening section 370–411. Though doubted by some in the past, the ascription of the *Epitaph for Adonis* to Bion is accepted by Fantuzzi (1985) 139–146 and Reed (1997) 15, but Reed's unawareness of this Nonnian reminiscence (222, on *Adon.epit.* 44–50) leads him to miss the imaginative reworking of the ‘last kiss’ motif. Hubbard (1998) 40–41 contrasts the eroticism of *Adon.epit.* with the emotional restraint of Theocritus' *Id.* 1.

his guilt-feelings, and the emotional impact on him. Then the curtain of discretion falls; *λάχον ἑξαπίνης δέμας αἰόλον*, “I suddenly acquired a dappled body” (5.494) is all we now learn of the transformation, with aposiopesis: *σιγήσω τάδε πάντα· τί δεύτερον ἄλγος ἐνίψω;*, “I shall be silent on all of this. Why shall I tell of my second painful experience?” (5.497). The difference has been recognised, but not accounted for. Chuvin³⁶ rightly notes how Nonnus’ first account of the bathing scene is “plus voluptueuse” than that from Actaeon’s own mouth. But this is not, as Chuvin suggests, simply a matter of avoiding repetition. The actual arrangement is significant; the embarrassing details of the physical transformation (especially embarrassing in the mouth of a son addressing his father) and the vivid portrayal of the hounds’ savagery are confined to the authorial narrative, which is otherwise surprisingly lacking in detail. The pastoral lament inaugurated by Actaeon at 5.354–365 with *αἰλινον Ἀκταίωني* and resumed at 5.415–532 finds in the evocation of formalised literary grief and in the nostalgic recollection of a pastoral setting, of the sweating limbs of Artemis and of a momentary false step (5.473–496), a *pharmakon* for the cruel violence of the scene which precedes it and of which it is a ritual extension. Actaeon’s *psyche* finally asks his father to find his body and bury it, last rites which will do for his brutalised remains what the lament has done for the brutalising narrative—lay to rest the disturbing details of dismemberment and decently cover our embarrassed sensibilities.

The personal love-lament in Nonnus has many features in common with the tradition going back to Bion on which the Actaeon episode draws, as the story of Dionysus and Ampelus in Books 10 and 11 shows. Dionysus’ activity as a hunter (10.175, 251) marks him out, as it did Actaeon, as a figure at first quite distinct from the conventional pastoral setting, and although Ampelus may be a keen huntsman “away from” the pastoral scene (cf. *ἐκτός*, 10.224), his performance before Dionysus must exclude activities which threaten the security of the idyllic atmosphere (10.243–245); here he will hunt only under the guidance of Dionysus (cf. 10.329), who further distorts the pastoral harmony by introducing the alien sound of Cybele’s *kymbala* into the predominantly bucolic music (10.386–391).³⁷ For Ampelus’ bucolic dancing and music-making enchant the ears (10.230–242; cf. 276), as his physical

³⁶ Chuvin (1976) 96, stressing the complementary nature of the arrangement.

³⁷ See above n. 27. It is also through Dionysus that Ampelus will adapt his pastoral environment to accommodate snakes, bears, lions, and tigers (11.56–75).

appearance does the eyes (10.278; cf. 176); his bewitching music helps to establish the pastoral scene where unfolds the narrative of Dionysus' infatuation with him (10.178–216), their competition for prizes (10.330–338), their wrestling-match (10.339–382), an envious rival (10.238–249), and eventually θανατηφόρος Ἄτη, “deathbringing Delusion” (11.113),³⁸ which persuades Ampelus to take on a savage bull and so meet the fate of Adonis. A close parallel to Ampelus is provided in Book 29 by the case of the handsome, athletic warrior Hymenaeus (29.15–178), with his flowing hair (29.15 ~ 10.181–184) and dazzling brightness (29.18 ~ 10.186–188); he is adored by Dionysus and adopted by him as a bosom friend (29.28 ~ 10.193), suffers an Adonis-like wound in the thigh (29.87 ~ Bion, *Adon.epit.* 7) and is lamented by his heart-broken companion (29.98–99 ~ 11.253).³⁹ But even the explicit comparison with Ampelus in 29.108 cannot make the Hymenaeus narrative anything but a pale reflection of its model in the earlier book. This is not simply a matter of the story's length; the substitution of a battlefield for the pastoral backdrop, and the many allusions to Pandarus in *Iliad* 4,⁴⁰ rob the motif of the dying youth of an important element in the pathetic effect achieved in the cases of Adonis or Daphnis: pathos is always enhanced by an apparently uncomplicated simplicity in harmony with the natural world.

The reduced scale of the Hymenaeus episode shows how difficult it is to reproduce the full sensuousness of the encounter with Ampelus when the pastoral context has been superseded. By contrast, the Ampelus narrative glories in a degree of sensuousness which is sustained for over 500 lines (10.175–11.252),⁴¹ to such an extent that the reader's embarrassment is anticipated by the pastoral scenery itself, as a meadow blushes scarlet with roses under the tread of Ampelus' silver-white feet (10.190). Indeed, the suggestive power of the rose as a symbol of both sensuality and the flush of embarrassment is much in evidence elsewhere too,⁴² varying its effect from the ruddiness of Ampelus' honey-breathing mouth (10.188) to the rosy hue of his flesh (11.214)—which is preserved even after his death (11.245), when it ironically acquires

³⁸ Actaeon was destroyed by Μοῖρα (5.301), which is very much the usual term in Nonnus (see Peek's *Lexikon*, s.v.); Ἄτη is used uniquely here.

³⁹ Further parallels between Ampelus and Hymenaeus are listed by Vian (1990) 204.

⁴⁰ These are fully explained by Vian (1990) 205–206.

⁴¹ See especially the overt sensuality of 10.177–192, 264–277, 339–372, 11.17–42, 99–112.

⁴² The motif is discussed by Rosenmeyer (1992) 182–183, 210–213, 227–228.

a new, discordant significance as Ampelus' limbs are savagely gored by a bull. Polysemic reddishness is also found in the Hymenaeus narrative, but with no new complexity. The youth's rosy skin (29.17)⁴³ is soon red with blood from his wound (29.87, 102, 154), but repetition cushions us against recurring embarrassment over images of this kind. And Hymenaeus' recovery from his injury (29.161) deprives the episode of the richly emotional tableau which unfolds after the death of Ampelus.

It is partly because Dionysus is so insensitive to the subtle balances of the pastoral world that his lament for Ampelus (11.255–350) is unresponsive to the embarrassing detail of the accompanying narrative. But in addition to offering a further self-indulgent exercise which omits the expected ritual allusions, Dionysus is obliged to overlook a regular topos of the personal love-lament, that the surviving lover should willingly share the fate of the lost beloved. As a god, Dionysus knows that this is impossible for him (11.325–327),⁴⁴ and his inability to die with Ampelus means that his lament must ultimately fail in its aim of performing a traditional function as an ὀδυνηφάτον ἄλκαρ ἀνίης, “painhealing safeguard for distress” (11.361). As if to point out the deficiency and to supply it, Eros comes along (11.351) with a didactic narrative as a model of how such things should be done. The story he tells Dionysus of the love of the two youths Calamus and Carpus ends with the latter's death in a swimming accident and Calamus' extended lament for his beloved companion (11.431–477). Not only does Calamus include some allusions to the pastoral lament which were missing in Dionysus' speech,⁴⁵ but he ends with a proposed sepulchral inscription for them both (11.476–477)⁴⁶ and a suicide. Eros' more traditional pastoral lament seeks to

⁴³ Note how the colour contrast in the phrase (Ἴνδοὺς) κυανέους ὀδοσιδέι (χειρί), “(black) Indians with rosy (hands)” (29.17) is inverted two lines later in αἰγλήεντα δυσεδέι, “shiny hugky”, and is transferred to the “two-coloured” wound (διδυμόχροον ἔλκος) of 102 and 154. See Vian (1990) *ad loc.* for further parallels.

⁴⁴ The same restriction is a cause of grief to Aphrodite in Bion, *Adon.epit.* 53–54: ἅ δὲ τάλαίνα / ζῶω καὶ θεὸς ἐμὲ καὶ οὐ δύναμαι σε διώκειν, “I, alas, live, and am a god and may not go after you”. See Reed (1997) 227 for further parallels, Hunter (1999) 252 for the significance of ‘pursuing the one who flees’—pathetic here, since love *cannot* be requited.

⁴⁵ Note especially the first use of a ritual refrain (431, 442).

⁴⁶ For the motif see Bömer on Ovid, *Met.* 2.326–328, and a further amatory example in Nonnus at 15.361–362. A precedent and close parallel occur in the epitaph proposed for (and by) the dying lover in [Theocr.] 23.43–48. If Hubbard (1998) had taken account of Nonnus' reworking of Pastoral, he would not have phrased the concluding question of his first chapter (44) as he does.

do for Dionysus what the god cannot do for himself—to beguile his over-indulgent grief and enchant him out of the extremities of passion (11.482–483):

τοῖα παρηγορέων φίλῳ μειλίζατο μῦθῳ
 θεοῦρος Ἐρως, γλυκὺ κέντρον ἑλαφρίζων Διονύσῳ.

furious Eros soothed him with the comfort of these sweet words, making light of Dionysus' sweet pangs.

3. *Hymnus and Nicaea*

The full realisation of these motifs from the pastoral tradition is achieved in the lament for Hymnus at 15.370–419. More so than Cadmus, Actaeon, or Ampelus, Hymnus is an archetypal pastoral figure,⁴⁷ variously described as a βουκόλος (15.213, 308, 361), νομεύς (15.220, 305, 401), βούτης (15.204, 312, 390, 399), and ποιμήν (15.398). He plays his pastoral music on a *syninx* (15.303), a truly λιγύθροος βούτης, “musical oxherd” (15.419), whose musical world embraces the *aulos* as well (15.417). When he becomes infatuated with Nicaea, his passion for her finds expression in terms which appropriately have familiar pastoral associations. He is a victim of Eros the trickster (15.220),⁴⁸ and is wounded by love (15.244),⁴⁹ so that his passion runs deep (15.209);⁵⁰ he neglects his cattle (15.209–214)⁵¹ and admires Nicaea for the white brilliance of her skin (15.237–243).⁵² The unyielding Nicaea recognises this collection of pastoral tags for what it is, a kind of ποιμενίης ... βοῆς μέλος, “music from the pastoral soundworld” (15.310) of the infatuated *syninx*-player (cf. 15.306) and *boukolos* (15.308), and in her reply she taunts

⁴⁷ His *καλαῦρος*, “truncheon” (15.208) is used simply for keeping the herd together, as demonstrated by Longus, 1.8.2, and should not be interpreted as a kind of *λαγωβόλον*, “staff”, whose unsuitability for a pastoral scene is discussed by Rosenmeyer (1969) 136–137.

⁴⁸ *δολόεις* Ἐρως is here derived from *δολομάχανος* Ἐρως in Theocr. 30.25–26, with *δολόεις* borrowed from Homer's depiction of the enchantresses of the *Odyssey* (7.245, 9.32).

⁴⁹ A pastoral context for this familiar topos is supplied by Theocr. 11.15, 30.10, and Bion, *Adon.epit.* 17. See further Callim. *AP* 12.134.1 = *HE* 1103 and A.S. Pease on Virgil, *Aen.* 4.2 (*volnus*).

⁵⁰ εἰς βαθὺν ἦλθεν Ἐρωτα, “he fell deep in love” (209) quotes the infatuation of Atalanta at Theocr. 3.42 εἰς βαθὺν ἄλατ' ἔρωτα, on which see Hunter (1999) 124 *ad loc.*

⁵¹ For the motif see Theocr. 11.12–13.

⁵² For the attraction of white skin see, e.g., Theocr. 11.19–20.

Hymnus with the unpromising parallels supplied in the pastoral myths of Pan and Echo, Daphnis, and Apollo and Daphne (15.306–311).

Nicaea, by contrast, is a Bacchic figure,⁵³ quite alien to the traditional bucolic picture, who will eventually find an appropriate (if unwelcome) partner in Dionysus himself. An Amazon, she rejects love (15.172), lives in a remote, rocky area (15.175, 192–193), and hunts wild bears with lions harnessed to her chariot (15.184–186). She rejects bucolic animals as beneath contempt (15.182–183), and is more at home with lions, whom she whips (15.185) and who lick her in return (15.198). Hymnus can think of nothing sweeter than to become part of her world, literally abandoning his own bucolic relationship with his animals (15.214–219) to share Nicaea's Dionysian relationship with hers. Tricked out of his bucolic identity by *dolos* at work in the pastoral world (15.220), Hymnus longs to become the weapons Nicaea handles (15.258–270). Actaeon was changed into a stag against his will; Hymnus *wants* to become one (15.316–341) to be shot at by Nicaea, on condition that when she draws the bow she puts the bow-string next to her rosy breast (15.334). As a substitute he gets hold of some of her gear to kiss it (15.290–296), but even this is as nothing compared with watching her leaping over the rocks as the wind catches and swells her clothes (15.221–228). Nonnus' descriptive power, with its intense colour-sensitivity and its emphasis on gazing at an object with total absorption, here again reaches an embarrassing peak of uninhibited candour. At an early stage in the transmission this intensity proved too much for one copyist, who deleted from the text what may have been some of Nonnus' most vividly revealing lines.⁵⁴ When the picture resumes at 15.230 Hymnus' gaze has moved from her thighs to her hair. The copyist's act of censorship can be read as a critical observation: such freely indulged explicitness, which arouses the reader's embarrassment, has no part to play in the pastoral mode, whose function is (in part) to assuage it and to provide, through enchantment, the *pharmakon* for it.

As Hymnus receives his desired death at Nicaea's hand, we have the most elaborate representation of the pastoral lament in the *Dionysiaca* (15.370–422). Its position is significant, making it into something much

⁵³ In a number of respects her lifestyle seems to be equipping her to emulate the activities of the Bassarids (14.353–385).

⁵⁴ Hermann's suggestion of a lacuna after l. 228 has now been confirmed by a gap in the 6th-cent. Berlin papyrus, for which see Keydell (1959) 11*–12*. The lacuna which Graefe suggested after 10.346 comes at a similarly intense moment in a passionate narrative, and doubtless for the same reason.

more than a ritual exercise to compensate for the embarrassing explicitness of Hymnus' passion. It remains that in part, but there is here more than an individual passion to lament or exorcise. Books 13 and 14 are elaborate martial catalogues of the armies of earth and heaven gathering for the war Dionysus will wage against the Indians. The war will alter the course of the poem both as a narrative and a confluence of generic forms. The pastoral mode is almost exhausted as an independent force, and its instruments must serve a new purpose. At the end of Book 14 the first battle is joined with the Indians, and suddenly, in the mayhem (l. 404):

ἔβρεμε σῦριγξ,
σῦριγξ ἐργεκύδομος, ἐπέκτυπε δ' αὐλὸς ἐνυσούς

the *syrinx* rang out, the *syrinx* calling men to battle; the *aulos* sounded for war.

In Book 25 the poet's musical horizons are enlarged to include the Pindaric φόρμιγξ, "lyre" (25.21); at 25.268 the *syrinx* produces an ἀγέστρον ἦχον, "sound to summon the army", and is appropriately joined in the next line by Homer's σάλπιγξ, "trumpet", while at 26.14–15 the *aulos* and the *salpinx* should together be rousing the army of Deriades. Pastoral music cannot compete with these sounds, and this gives the pastoral lament at the end of Book 15 a particular importance: it is a lament not merely for the dead shepherd Hymnus but for the whole pastoral mode as an independent generic influence on the wider context of the poem. The crucial factor which puts an end to the pastoral power of enchantment is the rise to adulthood of Dionysus himself, who has enchanting powers of his own and has no need for those derived from a literary tradition. An extraordinary example has already appeared at the end of the previous book (14.411–437), when Dionysus temporarily brings the fighting to a halt by pouring wine into the waters of the Hydaspes and inducing his enemies to drink until they are senseless. Wine now achieves what pastoral music enabled Cadmus to do to Typhon; the world is changing, and so the pastoral lament at 15.370–422 expresses a poignant nostalgia by adhering to the traditional mode.⁵⁵ The name of its subject, which is scarcely found outside

⁵⁵ On the general structure of the literary lament see Alexiou (1974). The earlier stages in the tradition are discussed by Mumprecht (1964) 9–30. Nonnian laments have literary affiliations appropriate to their subjects. The lament for Opheltes in Book 37 is accompanied by funeral games around his pyre, and is extensively modelled, as Keydell (1927) 428 = (1982) 478 says, on *Iliad* 23, while the lament for Orontes and Deriades at

Nonnus' version of the story of Nicaea,⁵⁶ suggests in itself the hymnlike function of the lament in this context.

In the lament Nonnus draws on many features of the models in Theocritus, Bion, and ps.-Moschus. Like Daphnis in Thyrsis' song in *Id.* 1, Hymnus is, of course, bewailed as a victim of Love. Bulls and calves join the lament for him (15.396–397), imitating the πολλοὶ ταῦροι, “many bulls” and πολλάι δαμάλαι, “many heifers” of the Thyrsis lament in Theocr. 1.74–75, while grief brings wolves and lions on to the pastoral scene to bewail the loss of both Hymnus (15.407–408) and Daphnis (15.71–72). Love himself becomes the object of reproach (15.395 ~ *Id.* 1.98), vengeance is promised (15.384–385 ~ *Id.* 1.103), and the cruelty of an unyielding mistress is emphasised (15.380 Ἀστακίδος ... ἥθεα νύμφης, “practices of the nymph of Astacos”; *Id.* 1.100–101 Κύπρι βαρεῖα ... νεμεσσατά, “Cypris oppressive ... vengeful”). A wider ranger of mourners is traceable to Bion's *Epitaph for Adonis* and [Moschus]' *Epitaph for Bion*: ὄρεσιτιάς ἄχνυτο Νύμφη, “the mountain Nymph grieved” (15.371) echoes *Adon.epit.* 19 Νύμφαι κλαίουσιν ὄρειάδες, “the mountain Nymphs lament”, and introduces the Nymphs who teach the *boukolos* his song at Theocr. 7.92;⁵⁷ the grief of the river Rhyndacus (15.372–373) recalls the lamenting rivers of *Adon.epit.* 33–34 and *Bion.epit.* 2, while the very rare adjective ἀσάμβalos, “unshod” (15.373) occurs in *Adon.epit.* 21 in the form ἀσάνδαλος, and there describes the distraught appearance of the grieving Aphrodite; the grief expressed for the dead Hymnus by Pan (15.417), Echo (15.389), and Apollo (15.420) is paralleled at *Bion.epit.* 28, 30, and 26, and Echo at *Adon.epit.* 38; Aphrodite's anguish (cf. 15.391) is also emphasised in the cases of Adonis (*Adon.epit.* 19–21, 35–39) and Bion (*Bion.epit.* 68–69). Hymnus is mourned by singing oak trees (15.390), which can be heard lamenting at *Adon.epit.* 32 and in the *threnos* for Daphnis at Theocr. 7.74 (cf. *Bion.epit.* 3), while trees and rocks

40.101–214 is based on the lament of the women for Hector at *Il.* 22.430–515. Keydell (1932a) 192–193 = (1982) 504–505 points to the general comparison between Euripides' *Bacchae* and Books 45–46, and it can be argued that Agave's lament for the dead Pentheus (46.283–319) is so strongly suggestive of a powerful tragic *rhexis* that it is as likely to be a reflection of the Euripidean original as anything in the *Christus patiens*.

⁵⁶ Hymnus is not mentioned by Memnon of Heraclea (*FGH* 434, 28.9), who concentrates exclusively on Nicaea's relationship with Dionysus but is in other respects close to Nonnus. On the myth of Nicaea see Robert (1977) 12–16. This point develops an observation made to me by Professor M.D. Reeve.

⁵⁷ Nonnus here preserves the Homeric form of the adjective ὄρεσιτιάς (*Il.* 6.420, *HHom.Pan.* 19); ὄρειάς, used elsewhere by Nonnus, is not attested in literary texts until Antipater of Sidon. See Reed (1997) 204.

beg Nicaea to let Hymnus live (15.404–406). The tragic cry of grief αἶλινά (15.381) is reproduced from *Bion.epit.* 1, while the οὐ τόσον ... ἐδακρύσαντο, “not so much ... they cried” construction at 15.381–382 imitates the much more extensive model at *Bion.epit.* 37–44.⁵⁸

Thyrsis’ lament contains epic allusions which “sound a note discordant with pastoral peace and pastoral song”,⁵⁹ and the Hymnus lament follows this pattern at 15.377–378 with an allusion to the story of Buco-lion and Abarbarea in *Il.* 6.21–28. But the major sources Nonnus uses for his mythology must surely be Hellenistic. His reference to the river Rhyndacus (15.372–373) has, with its allusion to Ῥυνδακίς ... κόρη, “Rhyndacus’ daughter”, an aetiological flavour which suggests a debt to Callimachus’ treatment of the Rhyndacus in *On rivers* (fr. 459 Pfeiffer). Callimachus (*Hec.* fr. 116 Hollis) is also a likely origin for Ἀδορήστεια as a title of Nemesis (15.392–393), though Antimachus (fr. inc. sed. 131 Matthews = 53 Wyss) may be the source of the name for both poets.⁶⁰ The location of Niobe’s rock at Sipylus (15.374) may be derived from Euphorion (*CA* fr. 102),⁶¹ and the grief of the Heliades (15.382) from Apollonius (4.603–605), while Rhea’s lamentation (15.386–388) reproduces her response to the death of the *boukolos* Attis at [Theocr.] 20.40.

Repeated cries of χαίρετε, “farewell” concluding the laments for Hymnus (15.415–416) and Daphnis (Theocr. 1.144–145) give a sense of finality which in each case has implications for the whole pastoral world as well as for the dead *boukolos*.⁶² Repetition is an essential part of ritual conceived as a φρενοθελήης αἰοιδή, “song to enchant the senses”, which explains Nonnus’ use of the refrain at ll. 399, 403, 409, and 414.⁶³

⁵⁸ Some of these ps.-Moschus parallels are discussed in connection with the Hymnus lament by Mumprecht (1964) 30–32. On personified Echo (389), especially appropriate to this richly indebted section, see Reed (1997) 218. Hunter (1999) 282–283 traces the sources for Echo as ‘a mythical model for bucolic poetry’.

⁵⁹ Segal (1981) 4. Cf. Hunter (1999) 89–98 passim, Halperin (1983a) 174–183 and 238–244.

⁶⁰ Hollis (1990) 301–302 convincingly argues against the idea that *Hec.* fr. 116 refers to the city of Adrastea rather than to a title of Nemesis.

⁶¹ For the source of Sipylus see Vian (1959) 131–133, where the importance of Euphorion in the transmission of the Niobe myth is explained.

⁶² Nonnus places the χαίρετε-formula immediately after his last refrain, and uses it to mark the end of the lament. He therefore most likely read the original Theocritean formula at 1.144–145 as concluding Thyrsis’ song. See Goldhill (1991) 245. Hubbard (1998) 41–44 notes some of these parallels between Bion, the *Bion.epit.* and Theocritus’ *Id.* 1, but surprisingly omits their major intertextual transformation in Nonnus.

⁶³ For the importance of the refrain in lament see Alexiou (1974) 134, Hunter (1999) 86 on Theocr. 1.64.

In Theocritus' *Id.* 2 the first refrain is part of the bewitching ritual for winning back Delphis (the examples of Circe and Medea at ll. 15–16 are not invoked for nothing), but the second is part of a different ritual, the lament for lost love, which begins with πόθεν τὸν ἔρωτα δακρύσω; “from what point shall I lament my love?” at l. 64 and turns into a self-beguiling expression of grief through reminiscence. The refrain for Daphnis' dying moments in Theocritus' *Id.* 1 (ll. 127, 131, 137, 142) is of this latter kind, and finds an echo in Nonnus, where it encloses a retelling of the death of Hymnus. The first part of Nonnus' refrain—βούτης καλὸς ὄλωλε, “the fair oxherd is dead”—inverts the refrain ἀπώλετο καλὸς Ἀδωνις, “fair Adonis is dead” which Bion's Erotes repeat at ll. 5, 37–38, 63, and 67,⁶⁴ and which is cunningly worked into [Moschus]' *Lament on Bion* in forms like καλὸς τέθνακε μελικτάς, “the fair singer is dead” (l. 7; cf. 11–12, 18).⁶⁵ The way in which these voices echo in poem after poem confirms their ritual function and intensifies their beguiling power, which should achieve its fullest impact in Nonnus. In fact, however, the Nonnian line also contains a novel element, so unexpected and disturbing that it undermines the predictability of the refrain in a lament of this kind.

Nonnus alone repeatedly draws attention in his refrain to the cause of death: καλὴ δέ μιν ἔκτανε κόρυς, “a beautiful girl killed him”. It is not only the harshness of the alliteration which jars here, but the fact that these repeated references to the murderess make the recollection of the moment of death which they encompass into something more than a ritual restatement. We now see Nicaea's act as a defiance of the whole natural world, rocks, trees, and animals (15.404–408). Just as Nicaea denied Hymnus the φίλτρον, “cure” of enchantment and cruelly wounded him instead (15.400–401), so the lament of the animals,

⁶⁴ Nonnus' borrowing from Bion can be seen as an attempt to carry further the echoing effect of antiphonal choirs, which Estevez (1981) 36 plausibly suggests that Bion is aiming at in his first two lines. Estevez shows how Bion's refrain subtly changes its significance in the course of the lament, but I do not think Nonnus' imitative line works like that, any more than the refrains in Theocritus 1 or ps.-Moschus do (as Estevez admits on p. 41). Nonnus keeps the line invariable with the intention of stressing the unanimity of the response to the death of Hymnus throughout the animal kingdom, as cows (397), wolves, bears, and lions (407–408) join in the same song of grief.

⁶⁵ Cf. Mumprecht (1964) 31. The familiarity of the motif is confirmed by its use not only in ritual refrain but in a conventional epitaph such as that at ps.-Theocr. 23.45 (where there is doubtless an echo of the songlike refrain remembered from laments). See Fantuzzi (1985) 26. For further connections between Nonnus and ps.-Moschus see Chamberlayne (1916) 48.

though it may have the form and literary allusions proper to a *φρενο-θελγῆς ἀοιδή*, “song to enchant the senses”, has the effect of reactivating the pain it aims to soothe. Far from resolving the conflict between the incompatible natures of Hymnus and Nicaea (and between the incompatible influences, pastoral and Dionysiac, which they embody), the refrain actually encapsulates that contradiction of ‘Beauty undone by Beauty’ by varying the prosody of the alpha of *καλός* in each line, a device which itself has strong Alexandrian associations.⁶⁶ This intensification of grief helps to explain why the lament ends on a note of such bitterness and rejection (15.417–419).

As Daphnis dies, he hands over his *syrinx* to Pan (Theocr. 1.128–130), for there is no pastoral music in Hades.⁶⁷ The death of Hymnus, I have argued, has similarly fatal consequences for pastoral music in the *Dionysiaca*. The bucolic lament may look like a generic oddity when tacked on to the fifteenth book of an epic in this way, but in fact its role is integral, and the bold freedom of such writing within the epic convention is fully justified by its effect.⁶⁸ What confirms our sense of finality here is the joint cry of Pan and Apollo at 15.417–419: *αὐλὸς ἀλάσθω / ... / σῦργιξ, μηκέτι μέλπε*, “curse the *aulos*! ... *syrinx*, make music no longer”. This is not, as in the case of Theocritus’ Daphnis, the death of one *syrinx*-player who will be succeeded by others, but the death of an art proclaimed by its divine sponsors, Pan for the *syrinx*,⁶⁹ Apollo for the *aulos*, and they “sing together” (15.415–416 *ἀμφοτέρω ... ἀνιάχον*) to associate their instruments in the now familiar combination which evokes the pastoral world. Dionysus suggests something very different. When he arrives on the scene, he avenges Hymnus by raping Nicaea (16.265–291), and a more dramatic reversal of pastoral values could hardly be imagined. Nicaea is raped while under a spell, but the spell is not that of pastoral music. Like the Indian warriors before her, Nicaea is induced to drink from the Hydaspes (16.254), and sleep makes her participate unknowingly in her *μεθυσφαλέων ὕμεναίον*, “drink-reeling marriage” (16.284). The rape of Aura at the end of the poem is a parallel case: she is tied up and raped (48.628–630) after being

⁶⁶ Cf Theocr. 6.19, and Hopkins (1982) 166–167 for a comprehensive list.

⁶⁷ “[Daphnis’] art stands under the shadow of the fate engulfing him” is how Segal (1974a) 13 puts it in a sensitive reading of the passage.

⁶⁸ It was Chamberlayne (1916) 42 who described Nonnus as “a most audacious modernist”.

⁶⁹ Pan is named as its inventor at 41.372–373, where Hyagnis will devise the double *aulos*.

induced to drink the *Βακχείην ἀπατήλιον* ... *πηγὴν*, “deceiving spring of Bacchus” (48.594).⁷⁰ Dionysus’ intoxicating powers come to replace those of pastoral music, and this is the change which Pan and Apollo mark at the end of Book 15.

4. *The loss of identity: Pastoral dissolved*

The lament for Hymnus therefore marks a cardinal point in the narrative. The transition which takes place here is illustrated by two later stories, that of Pan’s envy in Book 16 and that of Dionysus and Brongus in Book 17. Pan may still play his *donakes* (16.306), but he is jealous of Dionysus’ new, and superior, powers of enchantment (*ζῆλον ὑποκλέπτων ὑποκάρδιον*, “concealing his envy in his heart”, 16.307; cf. 321). A satyr taunts him with the prospect of abandoning the pastoral world and cultivating the *γαμοστόλον οἶνον Ἐρώτων*, “wine of love preparing for marriage” (16.319). Yielding to these taunts (16.329), Pan realises how the outcome of his pursuit of Echo could have been dramatically transformed if only he had been able to use wine to trap her and not simply his *syrinx* (16.324).⁷¹ In inventing wine, Dionysus brings a *φάρμακον Ἐρώτος*, “philtre against Love” which outclasses the traditional resources of the pastoral world (16.328–330). But it is in the case of Brongus that this invention achieves a more substantial consequence than Pan’s wishful thinking. As a poor shepherd whose home and food are the simple gifts of nature (17.39–51), Brongus is presented as a truly pastoral figure. He offers Dionysus goat’s milk (17.43–45), a sheep (17.46), and, with an explicit reference to Callimachus’ Molorchus, a poor *ποιμενίην δαῖτα*, “shepherd’s meal” (17.50–54).⁷² To set the seal on his pastoral credentials, Brongus finally produces for Dionysus the familiar instruments of bucolic music, playing Pan’s *syrinx* and the double *aulos* for him (17.69–70). Dionysus responds favourably (17.71), but then (17.74–80) offers Brongus a gift of his own, the new enchantment of wine, the real relief from care (17.82). The “old milk”, the *ἀρχαῖον*

⁷⁰ For a comparison between the two episodes see Keydell (1927) 399–400 = (1982) 449–450, Chamberlayne (1916) 51–55, and Vian (2003) 57–58.

⁷¹ Possibly Nonnus here alludes to a likely Alexandrian use of Pastoral in satyric drama; see Seaford (1984) 20–21.

⁷² The precursors of Brongus, including Molorchus, are discussed in the very full treatment of the Hospitality theme in Hollis (1990) 341–354. Cf. Gerbeau and Vian (1992) 8–10 and 130–131 (on 18.20–24).

γάλα for which Brongus has a long established appetite (17.78), represents all in the pastoral world that is superseded by Dionysus' invention, and which the god rejects as incapable of relieving human anxiety (17.80). As Pan had to acknowledge that his bucolic φάρμακον Ἐρωτος must give way to a new kind of intoxication, so Brongus sees his simple bucolic world complicated by the innovative technology of vinedressing (17.81–86); and he receives the νεόρρευτον ἱκμάδα ληνοῦ, “fresh-flowing liquid of the wine-vat” (17.72), whose stupefying effects will soon alarm Orontes and his army (17.172–175).

The stories of Pan and Brongus show pastoral instruments still performing their recognisable, though superseded, function. The transition to the musical syncretism effected by Dionysus gives these instruments a different, less individual, voice in what is invariably a new and contrasted setting. At 18.5–92, for example, Dionysus is welcomed by King Staphylus, whose feeling for luxury and splendour is conveyed in a wealth of epic *topoi*.⁷³ Significantly, the Dionysiac music for the feast they share is all-embracing: Πανιάδες σύριγγες, “pipes of Pan” from the pastoral world combine with *auloi* (18.104), *phorminx* (18.100), and an array of Bacchic instruments like *kymbala* (18.103), βοεῖη, “ox-hide shield” (18.105), and κρόταλοι, “castanets” (18.107).⁷⁴ In Book 20 the Bacchantes launch their first assault against the cruel Lycurgus, and the *syrinx* and *auloi* join with the Bacchic ῥόπτρον (20.300–307), *kymbala*, and *lympana* (20.327–328) in the attack. The simile which illustrates their temporary rebuff (20.333–342) carries us back to another world: with his *syrinx*, a shepherd (ποιμήν) rouses a *komos* for Pan,⁷⁵ but a sudden river-torrent disrupts the music, and the shepherd has to throw his *pektis* aside (20.335–338). There is an ironic touch here, since the sweeping away of the pastoral music is made to serve as a parallel for the momentary failure of the Bacchic instruments which had earlier overwhelmed it. Yet, if the parallel and the casual reference to Phaethon (20.334) are intended as prophetic hints of Dionysus' own fate, the simile is ultimately unsustainable. It is with the eventual fate of the doomed Lycurgus, defiantly struggling to maintain an independent voice (21.135–146), that the fate of pastoral music would be better identified.

⁷³ See Gerbeau and Vian (1992) 13–14.

⁷⁴ For references to the Bacchic *kymbala* see Gerbeau and Vian (1992) 138–139 (on 18.103–107); for βοεῖη see Vian (1990) 349 (on 29.285).

⁷⁵ The interaction of the simile with its narrative context helps to remind us of the pastoral associations of *syrinx* and *auloi* at 20.300–301. There seems to be a lacuna after 20.334, but I assume that ποιμήν (20.334a) must be the subject of ἔγειρε (20.335).

Equally short-lived is the repulse of Dionysus' army by the River Hydaspes at 23.192–224. With a destructive force that recalls the fate of the pastoral instruments in the simile at 20.333–340, the river sweeps away not only the Bacchic *salpinx* and *kymbala* (23.194–197) but also the Πανιάς σὺριγξ, “pipe of Pan” and διδυμόζυξ αὐλός, “double *aulos*” (23.211–212), both of which are now appropriated to Bacchic use and are actually to be produced for the Bacchantes from the δόνακες, “reeds” of the Hydaspes itself (24.35–40). The resulting conflation of instrumental sounds becomes the characteristic accompaniment of the Bacchantes going to war at 24.151–154 (*aulos*, *syrix*), 26.14–15 (*tympana*, *aulos*, *salpinx*), 27.221–227 (*tympanon*, *syrix*),⁷⁶ 28.41–44 (*rhopton*, *pektis*, *salpinx*), 29.283–290 (*aulos*, *kymbala*, *Panias syrix*, *salpinx*, ox-hide shield),⁷⁷ 39.124–128 (*salpinx*, *aulos*, *Panias syrix*), and 43.70–74 (*aulos*, *tympana*).

The absorption of pastoral music into the polyphony of Dionysus and his followers is a different matter from its total suppression. We can see from the story of Alpus in Book 45 what might have been its alternative fate. Tiresias, urging Pentheus not to resist Dionysus, uses the giant Alpus as a suitable warning (45.172–215).⁷⁸ The location of the Alpus episode in the final stages of the poem offers a counterbalance to the gigantomachy of the opening; but whereas Typhon is defeated by pastoral music (Dionysus, of course, was as yet unborn), it is Dionysus' power alone which is able to crush Alpus. The story takes us back to the early part of the god's career, when the pastoral world had fallen victim to Alpus' oppressive instincts: ποιμήν, “shepherd” and βοῦτης, “oxherd” were no more (45.183, 189), Pan and Echo were silent (45.186), and the pastoral instruments were laid aside (*donakes* 45.185, *pektis* 186, *aulos* 187). It was therefore impossible to beguile Alpus as Cadmus had charmed Typhon, and only the arrival of Dionysus could challenge the giant's strength. Alpus, an emphatically massive figure (45.200–203), is killed by “a small bacchic wand” (ὀλίγω ... θύρσω, 45.208), but there is no pastoral ‘restoration’: Dionysus intervenes not to revive the pastoral world but, as we have seen, to drown its delicate instrumental colour in the raucous Bacchic cacophony.

⁷⁶ The adjective πομῆν (27.227) emphasises the pastoral associations of the instrument which now makes its Phrygian (i.e. Bacchic) sound in the battle-line.

⁷⁷ For the interpretation of βοῦτης here as a Bacchic tabor see Vian (1990) *ad loc.*

⁷⁸ The myth of Alpus is known only from the *Dionysiaca*. See also 47.627–628 and 25.237–241—though, as Vian points out *ad loc.*, the latter passage is not wholly consistent with the story at 45.172–215.

Dionysus' rejection of pastoral music is already anticipated in the proem to the whole poem (1.1–44). The proem is about Nonnus becoming a Dionysiac poet; his transformation into a Bacchant is enacted here, as the address to the Muses in 1.11 is replaced by one to the Bacchic Mimallons in 1.34.⁷⁹ The poet's music will therefore be Bacchic, the music associated with the *rhopton* (1.39), and he has no use for the non-Dionysiac enchantment (strongly suggested in ἡδυμελῆ, "sweet-sounding" (1.39) and ἔμπνοον ἤχῳ, "breath-given music" (1.41)) of pastoral music as represented by *donax* and *aulos* (1.41–42). These were the instruments of Marsyas (1.42–44), a Silenus-type figure, who in Nonnus is a pastoral musician: here (1.44) and at 19.322 he is styled a νομεύς, "herdsman",⁸⁰ while at 10.230–234 Dionysus compares him as a performer to the bucolic figure of the young Ampelus, whose playing of the *aulos* enchants the god. Nonnus therefore asks for these bucolic instruments to be handed to another poet (1.40) for the same reason that Apollo and Pan also cast them aside (15.416–418): the victory of Dionysus renders their pastoral music obsolete. The rejection of the sealskins at 1.37–38 fits well with this picture of a poetically triumphant Dionysus.⁸¹ The skins which Menelaus and his men wear in *Odyssey* 4 (ll. 435–459) are a false covering designed to ensnare Proteus in a trap (cf. δόλος, ll. 437 and 453). We have seen how, notably in the Cadmus episode, "trickery" is a force to be reckoned with in the pastoral world, compromising the superficial innocence of the musician. It may be that when Nonnus repudiates this Odyssean "trickery" at 1.37–38 he is in part trying to distance himself from such duplicity as a prelude to rejecting the pastoral pipes at 1.39–41. After all, Dionysus does not need any kind of subterfuge or subtly deceiving role-play to make his impact.⁸² It is wine, the Maronian (i.e. Thracian) nectar which is now

⁷⁹ Vian (1976) 9–10 sees the transformation from the point of view of the Muses themselves.

⁸⁰ The description of Marsyas as a *nomeus* seems to be unique to Nonnus. The usual picture of him is as a satyr (Ovid, *Met.* 6.383, *Fasti* 6.703; Hyg. *Fab.* 165; Lucian, *Podagra* 314; Philostr. *min.*, *Imag.* 2.4) and a Silenus figure (*Dion.* 19.329; see also Herod. 7.26.3; Paus. 1.24.1, 2.7.9, etc.). This aspect of Nonnus' Marsyas is not noted by Gerbeau and Vian (1992) on 19.321–322, though elsewhere (pp. 108–109) they mention several aspects of the myth which are peculiar to Nonnus.

⁸¹ Vian (1976) 10 takes 1.37–38 as a mock *recusatio*, drawing attention to the acknowledged influence of Homer at 25.253–263. In view of the significance given to pastoral music in the first fifteen books, the notion of a mock *recusatio* is attractive from more than one angle.

⁸² Nonnus' comic point here is that in the *Odyssey* it is the foul smell of the sealskins

the effective intoxicant (1.36–37), and it is this which the Dionysiac poet adopts as his symbol, rejecting the intoxication of beguiling “trickery” along with the musical instruments which arouse it.

5. *Colluthus*

It is in the Brongus episode (17.37–86) that Nonnus uses the arrival of innovative technology as a device to transform the naive simplicity of Pastoral into the new Dionysian syncretism. The manoeuvre may well have been noted by Colluthus, whose epyllion on Helen’s abduction by Paris pays Nonnus the compliment of deploying Pastoral in a not dissimilar, though by no means identical, narrative strategy.⁸³

The debt to Nonnus, evident in the poem’s vocabulary, verse-structuring and metrical patterns,⁸⁴ does not prevent Colluthus using such an obvious, and no doubt inescapable, dependence as a base from which to project his own poetic voice in an early and unexpected development. The abduction itself is placed within the frame of two fatally doomed marriages, the second being of course that of Paris and Helen (387–388). In the first, the wedding of Peleus and Thetis (17–69), the arrival of Eris provides the occasion for a programmatic statement of the poet’s ambivalent relationship to his immediate predecessor. Not only does the simile introducing her (41–45), significantly the only one in the poem, clearly derive from a simile in the later books of the *Dionysiaca* (42.185–188) as if to pick up a dropped thread,⁸⁵ but her first plan (49–58) is to wreak havoc on the proceedings in imitation of Typhon with something very like the chaotic violence of the gigantomachy in *Dion.* 1–2. In laying this plan aside, she turns to the golden apple to find her own, different *πρωτόσπορον ἀρχήν*, “primal

which beguiles Proteus. The poet’s capacity to beguile, like that of Dionysus’ wine, will have a sweeter smell to it.

⁸³ For the poet’s identity as the epicist from Lycopolis and the *Suda*’s Κόλουθος (α 1951 Adler, though the citation does not record the *Raptus* or any other epyllia), the spelling of his name and his early 6th-cent. dating, see Livrea (1968) XI–XIV and Orsini (1972) V–VII (henceforward “Livrea” and “Orsini”). I follow Orsini’s text and line-numbering. Livrea’s judgement is in both sufficiently erratic to persuade one that the review of Giangrande (1969) is less unbalanced than at first appears. A.W. Mair’s Loeb (1928) is at its least impressive in Colluthus.

⁸⁴ The debt to Nonnus and Homer is discussed in Orsini viii–xxvii and documented (undependably) in Livrea’s commentary *passim*.

⁸⁵ This is a closer parallel than the less plausible suggestions in Livrea 82 *ad loc.*

seed" (62) and with the phrase launches Colluthus' individual narrative strategy, but in a way which emphasises its continuing closeness to Nonnus by reproducing the line-ending from *Dion.* 41.129 to highlight the novelty of her initiative. Pastoral becomes an important resource in this narrative for exploring more fully the complex association of poet and model already foreshadowed in Eris' choice, and each of the three major episodes framed by the two marriages expresses this literary affiliation by reworking pastoral motifs in its own way.

6. *A bucolic Paris*

Paris is introduced as a *boukolos* (71–72, 87, 102–106), but his character is re-shaped to correspond more precisely to the requirements of Pastoral. He is usually a lyre-player,⁸⁶ which here goes unmentioned so that, like a Theocritean herdsman, he can apparently neglect his charges (112–113) and use *syrix* and *κάλαμοι*, "reeds" (110–111, 114) to harmonize with the Muses in the shade of the trees (121); his deities are Pan and Echo (115, 118), while dogs and bulls offer no vocal competition (116), lulled to sleep by the music's captivating charm (119–120).⁸⁷ Suitably equipped, he is then located in the familiar agonistic setting for bucolic *δικαστόλοι*, "judges" who award prizes in Theocritus and Virgil,⁸⁸ and as is appropriate to this context the prize apple itself becomes merely *ἐπήρατον ἔρνος*, "lovely fruit" here (130), a *pastoral* prize rather than the golden object of myth.⁸⁹ Like his bucolic predecessors too, Paris must in effect arbitrate between competing speeches while still untutored in rhetorical techniques himself. When confronted with the three divine competitors, he is innocently attracted by their physical beauty (132), deaf to the artistry of the merely verbal appeals to which Athena, who promises him victory in war (137–145), and Hera, who promises sovereignty of all Asia (146–153), trust their success. Formal instruction in strategy and government—note the absurdly jarring *διδάξω*, "I shall teach you", in 144—is a ludicrous irrelevance to anything a character in

⁸⁶ References in Livrea 124.

⁸⁷ Only in Pastoral does this happen in day-time. More conventionally, the pipes call the natural world to rest at night (cf. Eurip. (?), *Rhes.* 551–556).

⁸⁸ 290–291. Rosenmeyer (1969) 153–167 points out that the more usual competition is a singing-match without an umpire.

⁸⁹ Contrast its description at 166–167, but a pastoral prize cannot be of that kind (Rosenmeyer (1969) 162–165).

Pastoral is likely to feel the need for, but Paris' indifference is primarily a lack of response not to the content of the speeches but to the rhetorical force of mythos itself, even from the lips of goddesses. This becomes evident in the case of Aphrodite. Her speech (159–166) is accompanied by an unabashed physical display of frontal nudity (154–157), to secure through the eyes the approval which bucolic naivety is unable to concede to the technical sophistication of artful rhetoric, and she promises him more of the same (ἀθρήσει, “you will see”, 165) when he goes to Sparta. Significantly, her speech proves to be only the secondary factor in her success: οὐπω μῦθος ἔληγεν, ὁ δ' ἀγλαὸν ὥπασε μῆλον, “her speech was not yet finished, and he gave her the gleaming apple” (166). The impact of the vision is decisive; the speech arts fail to make a correspondingly forceful impression.

The narrative emphasizes the central importance of this fatal moment by unveiling the real nature and full potential of the simple pastoral gift, the ἐπήρατον ἔρνος, “lovely fruit” (130). That earlier reference suppressed its visual splendour to fit it neatly within a bucolic context, but its exposure as an ἀγλαὸν ... μῆλον, “gleaming apple” (166) now converts it more appropriately into an “offering” to the golden “splendour” of Aphrodite herself, ἀγλαΐης ἀνάθημα (167). The victorious goddess picks up this very point, repeating for the third and fourth time in only seven lines the word which lifts the veil on what lay concealed from the shepherd: ἀγλαΐην ἐφίλησα καὶ ἀγλαΐη με διώκει, “the gleam of beauty is what I most love and what follows me closely” (172). Enclosed in this word's two paired appearances, the gift's fatal consequence is at last made doubly explicit as well: φυταλιὴν πολέμοιο, κακὴν πολέμοιο γενέθλην, “a plant of war, an evil seed of war” (168). But this is the moment of fatal consequence not only for Troy but also for the pastoral innocence which has until now sheltered Paris in his instinctive, untrained responses. Having first won her prize by appealing to this very naivety, Aphrodite now reveals herself in her masterly song of triumph (171–188) to be the instrument by which pastoral simplicity is overwhelmed in the irresistible flood of rhetorical sophistication. Every aspect of her performance in this speech proclaims a parallel triumph for the recondite resources of learned Alexandrian poetics: anaphora at the bucolic caesura (171), the metrical placing of the double ἀγλαΐη (172), Ἄρῃς/Ἀρῃς (177),⁹⁰ here echoed in the etymology of ἐπάρηξε, “came to

⁹⁰ The feature is discussed in Hopkinson (1982).

aid", in the same line, the verbal opposites at either end of 184 enclosing the opposing nouns, the internal balance of word arrangement in 185—these are a few immediately obvious instances. This is a performance from which Paris does not fail to learn, enormously extending the range and depth of his art at the same time as he loses the carefree innocence of his simple bucolic music and pastoral scenery.

7. *Paris as artful speaker*

Although he is therefore to become Δύσπαρις (193), his future partner cannot as yet fittingly be termed Δυσελένη.⁹¹ In the second major episode to be considered here, the meeting of the two lovers (247–325), Helen's first reaction to her visitor recalls that of the naive Paris to one of his. Each is instantly infatuated by visual exposure to physical beauty (κόρον δ' οὐκ εἶχεν ὀπωπῆς, "she could not gaze on him enough", 257), the comparison being reinforced by Helen's momentary confusion as to whether her suitor is in fact Aphrodite's golden son (258–259).⁹² Her brief address of welcome (266–275) even echoes the "shrill sound" of the pastoral music (λγύθροος, 276; cf. λγυρήν, 111, λγύπνοον, 309). In contrast, Paris' reply now gives voice to the instruction of Aphrodite, as he offers a μελιχίην ... γῆρυν, "honeyed speech", a richly sophisticated song of seduction, honey-soaked in its artistry,⁹³ and so inevitably, if fatally, persuasive. Aphrodite's rhetoric is more than a general influence; it becomes the object of direct *imitatio* as Paris models his taunting climax (299–302) on that of her first speech (186–188),⁹⁴ and the basis for the student to display an independent self-confidence in the irony of the ambiguous Κύπριν (297) which the emphatic ἐμὴν turns into something more intimate than a variation on Κυθήρεια (296), and in the disarmingly revealing rhetorical question following aposiopesis: οὐκ ἐρέω· τί δὲ τόσσον ἐπισταμένην σε διδάξω;, "I shall say no more. Why should I teach you who know so much?" (298). The real force of

⁹¹ The name-play is Homeric (*Il.* 3.39) and Euripidean (*Hec.* 945, *Or.* 1387, *IA* 316).

⁹² χρύσειον inevitably recalls at this juncture the most conspicuous feature of the prize which set the mischief in motion. Eros or not, Paris does not need a quiver (260) to have inflicted the fatal wound.

⁹³ Honey symbolically places the poet 'on a par with the most famous legendary singers', Hunter (1999) 105–106 on Theocr. 1.146–148.

⁹⁴ Parallels are listed in Livrea 213. The speech as a whole owes much to the ravishing Theocritean epithalamium for Helen (18).

this last verb can be sensed in the wider range of literary allusion. The obvious source of the affirmation of identity in 283–284 is *Odyssey* 9.19–20, but Paris in fact adheres more closely to the Virgilian reworking of this in Aeneas’ declaration to Dido.⁹⁵ Among the striking parallels between the two petitioners is that each boasts of his Trojan origin (278–281; *Aen.* 1.375–376), is sent on his mission by Aphrodite (295; *Aen.* 1.382 *matre dea monstrante viam*, “his mother-goddess showing the way”), and prefaces his affirmation of identity (283; *Aen.* 1.378) with two conditional clauses, of which Paris’ first (278–279 εἴ τινά που Φρυγίης ἐνὶ πείρασιν γαῖαν ἀκούεις, / Ἴλιον ..., “if you have heard of any place in the bounds of Phrygia, Ilion ...”) closely echoes and then extends Aeneas’ second (1.375–376 ... *si vestras forte per auris / Troiae nomen üt*, “... if by chance the name of Troy has reached your ears”). Uniquely though, for all the circumstantial detail Paris gives about his home and ancestry (278–288), he departs from the Homeric-Virgilian model by withholding the one detail, his actual name, which such speeches are conventionally designed to impart. This is noticed by Helen, whose brief and untutored reply (306–314), for the most part merely a resumé of what she has just heard, must teasingly open once again with ὦ ξεῖνε, “stranger” (306; cf. 266).⁹⁶ Such a performance outclasses the now discarded ἀγροτέρων καλάμων ... αἰοδὴν, “melody of the rural reeds” (111).

8. *Marking the transition*

The pastoral scene effortlessly supplies the material needs of all its inhabitants. In contrast, such necessities as agricultural labour, construction and hazardous sea-voyaging mark the turning-point towards a culture in which natural resources, including language, are exploited and sophisticatedly manipulated for human self-interest. Nonnus represents this transition in the Brongus episode, and Colluthus gives the same symbolic role to innovative technology in the construction of the ships which will carry Paris to Sparta (190–200). The different context enables the point to be elaborated, for *technē* can here be illustrated by the self-reinforcing form of ἐργόπονος Ἀτρυνώνη, “task-labouring Atry-

⁹⁵ On the influential presence of Latin literature in the Greek culture of late antique Egyptian Thebes, see Cameron (1982) 232–234.

⁹⁶ For this reason we can be sure the name was not contained in the brief lacuna after 288.

tone" (194),⁹⁷ by tree-felling (195), the *περιφροσύνη*, "surpassing skill" of Phereclus (196), which connects this fatal journey with the consequently inevitable destruction of the city through the wooden horse he will also devise, by shipbuilding (198; note the harsh alliteration in *δοῦτόμῳ τεκτῆνατο χαλκῷ*, "fashioned with wood-cutting bronze"), strategic planning (*προβέβουλε*, "planned in advance", 199), and sea travel with the curse of the *ἀλὸς ἔργα*, "works of the sea" (229) of which Paris had been "unaware" previously (*ἀγνώσσω ἀλὸς ἔργα*, 8). Colluthus is putting to use the familiar features of a much-worked epic/elegiac *schetliastos*,⁹⁸ but also developing more fully the theme already announced in the poem's opening lines (1–10), where the river-nymphs of pastoral legend (here unexpectedly invoked instead of the usual Muses)⁹⁹ are confronted with the threatening prospect of the open sea, as yet unknown to them as to Paris (*ἀήθεα πόντον*, "unaccustomed sea", 7). When Paris effects the transition, he substitutes for the innocent *μουσική*, "music" of his pipes (115) the rhythmic harshness of the *δοῦπος ἔρετιμών*, "splashing of oars" (227), confirming the significance of a change already alluded to in *νηῶν ἀρχεκάκων*, "ships which began our troubles" (8–9) and there presented as incompatible with his bucolic identity (*ἵνα πόντον ... ὀρίνη / βουνόλος*, "that an oxherd should stir up the sea", 9–10).

What is adumbrated in this way in the poem's preface finds explicit confirmation in its third major episode, the lament of Hermione (326–386). To mark near-closure here by recalling a near-closing scene in the *Dionysiaca* (47.116–200) is to resort to a straightforward and easily demonstrable strategy,¹⁰⁰ but the parallels between Hermione and Erigone do not in fact extend far beyond the reappearance of a departed parent in vision and the pathos of a griefladen complaint by the orphaned child. Rather, it is Colluthus' preface which Hermione should immediately call to mind, as she throws off in order to weep (326–327) the veil which the river-nymphs had there laid aside to dance (2–4), and which Cassandra will soon discard in despair (389–390). She expresses her grief through her relationship to the natural world, to mountains (347, 351, 374), meadows (348), woods (356, 358) and the

⁹⁷ Athene's title here makes her complicit in the aftermath of her own defeat, reactivating Aphrodite's humiliating taunt in 179.

⁹⁸ Smith (1913) 245–247 on Tib. 1.3.37–40, Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 43–44.

⁹⁹ Livrea 56–57, Orsini IX–X.

¹⁰⁰ The comparison with Nonnus' Erigone is discussed in Orsini XXIII–XXVI.

animals which inhabit them (352–353), to birds (381), trees (357), rivers (347, 359–362) and stars (349–350), so that her lament takes on the role which that for the death of Hymnus performed in the *Dionysiaca*. As in his case, using a repertoire traceable back to Theocritus and Bion, the scenic figures of Pastoral themselves become instrumental in articulating the lament for its passing. Hermione is aware that her relationship with it has changed. What once provided a harmonious context for the melodies of Paris' pipes now echoes to her groans and pathetic complaint, and her persisting trust in its fundamental innocence (352–353, 362), despite the deep-seated suspicion that it is somehow implicated in her mother's disappearance, can only confirm her in the distraught and bewildered state her rhetorical questions vainly express. When Nonnus transformed the function of Pastoral by redeploying an idyllic backdrop to serve as an active player in a miniature drama of lamentation, he advanced, as we have seen, the poem's design by marking symbolically a dramatic turning-point in its narrative. For Colluthus also, the transformation is made integral to the poetic scheme, though not in his case to seal the success of an overwhelming external intervention, but to explore the implications of the protagonist's own choices and decisions both for himself and for those closely and adversely affected by them.

It is rightly on Paris, then, that the focus of the closing lines is centered (376–386). In the moment which has passed since the naively infatuated Helen made her willing nocturnal departure with him (322–325), even while her small daughter¹⁰¹ was still appealing to all nature with pathetic cries of loss and despair (326–362), Paris has perpetrated on her the supreme violence of sexual domination which is here, with euphemistic irony, termed ἁρμονίην Ἀφροδίτης, “harmonious union of Aphrodite” (375).¹⁰² The pun immediately shows that the enforced sexual act now provides Paris with the intoxicating delight he once experienced in his bucolic music. The irony, however, runs deeper, since their physical conjunction is in so many other respects a break for both of them with everything which has gone before. Helen is no longer naive or simply infatuated (377–378); Paris has exchanged his pastoral music (110–111) for the language of lies and deception (ἀπατήλιος, 378), his role as simple *boukolos* for that most unbucolic of characters, the sexual

¹⁰¹ Hermione's precise age is not significant, though the [Apollod.] *Epit.* 3.3.3 (188.14 Wagner) gives it as nine years.

¹⁰² On the re-positioning of line 375 in Helen's speech see Orsini (1972) 18, n. 1. For the phrase cf. l. 26 and Livrea 77–78.

predator and rapist (ἥρπασεν, 378), his submission to law and custom (θεμιστοπόλος μηλοβοτήρ, “law-dispensing shepherd”, 5), recognized in his divinely conferred status as judge (θεμιστεύσειας ... δικάζων, 128), for the reputation of having become their violator (ἄνῆρ ἀθεμίσιος, “lawless man”, 383).

In Nonnus the pastoral lament inaugurates a new era of unbounded sensual stimulation and material abundance. Colluthus’ vision is, if anything, more Hesiodic. It is therefore appropriate to his poem’s moral emphasis that the lament for the lost innocence of Pastoral is spoken by a young child, still imagining herself able to converse with nature but now, perhaps for the first time, aware she hears nothing in reply. While Nonnus’ lament glances back to mourn a literary mode which has outlived its usefulness, that of Colluthus goes further, deploring in addition what has succeeded it, the degenerate, aggressive appetite for self-fulfilment at others’ expense which Helen belatedly discovers in her abductor (376–378). Against this, Pastoral’s disavowal of greed and exploitation stands no better chance of survival than it did when drowned out in the eclectic mélange of Dionysian music.¹⁰³

¹⁰³ Sections 2–5 are largely reproduced here, with the kind permission of the Cambridge Philological Society, from Harries (1994). Translations are adapted from Gow’s ed. maior of Theocritus and those in the “Loeb Classical Library”. My gratitude to Neil Hopkinson must be extended to encompass Marco Fantuzzi, whose encouragement and practical assistance are greatly appreciated.

THE PASTORAL IN BYZANTIUM

JOAN B. BURTON

The revival of the genre of the ancient novel in 12th-cent. Byzantium (after a hiatus of some eight centuries) brought with it evidence of a continued and sophisticated readership of ancient bucolic/pastoral.¹ Four novels represent that revival for us—Theodorus Prodrōmus' *Rhodanthe and Dosicles*, Nicetas Eugenianus' *Drosilla and Charicles*, Constantine Manasses' *Aristandros and Callithea*, and Eustathius Macrembolites' *Hysmine and Hysminias*.² Only fragments remain of Manasses' novel; the other three novels are extant in their entirety, and of these Eugenianus' draws on the bucolic/pastoral tradition most pervasively, with numerous references and allusions.³ Yet the bucolic/pastoral tradition figures in the other novels as well and offers a lens through which to view the novels responding to one another and to the tradition. Scholars have written much on cultivated gardens in the Byzantine novel,⁴ but the use of the bucolic/pastoral tradition (as linked with rural landscapes and herdsmen) has received little attention. This paper explores the intertextual innovation and sophistication of the 12th-cent. Byzantine novels' play with classical bucolic/pastoral themes and imagery.

Scholars often remark on the paucity of bucolic/pastoral literature among Byzantine writings, and indeed our two chief examples of free-standing Byzantine bucolic/pastoral poetry were composed only late in the Byzantine period.⁵ From the 13th century, the century also of our first manuscripts of Theocritus,⁶ we have a hexameter poem in mime form (a dialogue between a farmer and his friend), written by Maximus Planudes, a Byzantine scholar who also produced a commentary on

¹ Cf. Baldwin (1985) 235: "the strong bucolic element in their [the Byzantines'] romances can be seen as something of a surrogate [for Byzantine pastoral]".

² On the dating of the four Byzantine novels to the mid-12th century, see MacAlister (1991) esp. 209, Beaton (1996) esp. 212, Agapitos (1998) esp. 148, (2000) esp. 184–185. We have references to no other novels from that period.

³ The Greek texts used for this essay are Marcovich (1992, 2001); Conca (1990). On Eugenianus' use of bucolic/pastoral, see Milazzo (1985), Burton (2003).

⁴ E.g. Schissel (1942), Littlewood (1979), Barber (1992).

⁵ See also Hunger (1978) vol. 2, 148.

⁶ On the Byzantine mss. see Browning (1960/1980) 267, Fryde (2000) 231–232, 288.

Theocritus;⁷ from the 15th century, an anonymous hexameter poem in mime form (a dialogue between a herdsman and his friend).⁸

Yet Byzantine literature from early on reveals strong interest in Theocritean poetry as well as familiarity with bucolic/pastoral themes and imagery. Literary allusions, particularly to Theocritean poetry, appear throughout the Byzantine period. For example, Nonnus' 5th-cent. *Dionysiaca* includes a 'pastoral' lament modeled largely on Daphnis' song in Theocritus' *Id.* 1 (Nonnus 15.370–422).⁹ An epigram by the 5th-cent. poet Cyrus (*AP* 9.136) includes the familiar bucolic theme of a shepherd playing music for solace.¹⁰ Epigrams by the 6th-cent. writer Agathias echo phrases from Theocritean bucolic poems.¹¹ The 10th-cent. writer Ioannes Geometres' "second encomium of the apple" offers a later, extended example of easy familiarity with Theocritus' poetry.¹² In Byzantine literature, allusions to such authors as Moschus and Bion as well as Longus are more scarce than to Theocritus, yet they too figure in the construction of continued Byzantine interest in bucolic/pastoral themes and imagery.¹³ A 5th-cent. translation of Theocritus into iambic

⁷ For the Greek text of the poem, with commentary, see Holzinger (1893); Pontani (1973); for discussion see also Nissen (1936). On the Planudean edition of Theocritus, see Fryde (2000) 231–232; also Gallavotti (1993) 315–327.

⁸ For the Greek text, with commentary, see Sturm (1901); see also Baldwin (1985) 235–241, who calls this poem "a Byzantine Pastoral" and remarks: "I am not disposed to blame the Byzantines too much for not being prolific in this vein [the pastoral]" (quotation from p. 235).

⁹ On this lament see Harries (1994) 72–76 and this volume, pp. 530–536 (with attention also to models in Bion and ps.-Moschus' *Epitaph for Bion*).

¹⁰ For discussion see Cameron (1982) 230–235, who stresses the epigram's "unmistakable bucolic flavour", which he finds "the more interesting in that (excluding drama) pastoral is the one major Hellenistic genre that is conspicuous by its absence in early Byzantine times" (quotation from p. 231).

¹¹ E.g. *AP* 5.296.1–3 (cf. Theocr. 3.28–30; see Gow (1952) vol. 2, 71, on ll. 29–30), 299.9 (cf. Theocr. 1.134; Averil Cameron (1970) 22), 292.1–6 (cf. Theocr. 7.135–142; Elliger (1975) 426 and n. 4). Unfortunately we do not possess Agathias' nine-book *Daphniaca* (cf. *AP* 6.80).

¹² For the Greek text, with discussion, see Littlewood (1972) esp. 19–20, 78–80 (citing Theocr. *Id.* 5, 6, 8, 12, 15); as Littlewood observes, the carelessness of Geometres' quotations "suggest[s] that he knew Theocritus at first hand and not from a hand-book of quotations" (p. 78, on 19.23–25).

¹³ On a parallel to Longus, *Proem* 3 in *AP* 6.80, see Hunter (1983) 41–42 (who cautions that "only a greater knowledge of the *Δαφνιακά* than we possess would enable us to discover whether Agathias has here been influenced by Longus' prologue"). On linkages between an anacreontic poem by the 9th-cent. author Constantine of Sicily and Longus' novel as well as Mosch. 1 (*Runaway Eros*), see McCail (1988). On allusions to Bion's *Epitaph for Adonis* and ps.-Moschus' *Epitaph for Bion* (as well as to Theocr. *Id.* 1) in Nonnus 15.370–422, see Harries (1994), esp. 74–75, and this volume, pp. 532–534.

trimeters (an easier meter for Byzantines than hexameters) may have helped keep his poetry alive among the Byzantines.¹⁴ Further, the texts produced by Planudes' pupil Manuel Moschopoulos (late thirteenth/fourteenth century) include an influential collection of the first eight Theocritean *Idylls*.¹⁵ Moschopoulos produced editions of a number of classical authors, with the kind of elementary commentary appropriate for the classroom,¹⁶ and these editions suggest possible inclusion of these authors among earlier school texts as well.¹⁷ The suspicion that familiarity with Theocritus' poetry was generally expected of well-read Byzantines may be strengthened by the fact that Theocritus was not included in Photius' *Bibliotheca*, a 9th-cent. reader's guide that leaves out also other texts presumably familiar to educated Byzantines (Homer, Thucydides, Plato, Aristophanes, Gregory of Nazianzus).¹⁸ In light of the above, it is not surprising to find Theocritean-inspired bucolic themes resurfacing in the Byzantine novel.

1. *Prodromus*

Prodromus' novel, *Rhodanthe and Dosicles*, traditionally thought to be the earliest of the Byzantine novels,¹⁹ is modeled largely on Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus, and takes place mostly in a fictive world of

¹⁴ Cf. *Suda* μ 194 Adler, s.v. Μαριανός; for discussion see Hunger (1978) vol. 2, 116, Wilson (1983) 32. On how such a translation was "presumably" aimed at making texts "accessible to a wider public", see Cameron (1965) 482.

¹⁵ On the large number of mss. that include Moschopoulos' 'edition' of these poems, see Gallavotti (1993) 327–338; Gow (1952) vol. 1, xlv.

¹⁶ On how "Moschopoulos' aim was apparently to draw up a corpus of poetry for reading in school", see Wilson (1983) 244–247 (quotation from 245); see also Smith (1996) 394: "the syntactical and grammatical expositions in Manuel Moschopoulos from the end of the thirteenth century ... appear to bring us into the elementary Byzantine school".

¹⁷ For discussion of classical literature's role in Byzantine education, see Browning (1995); on Theocritus' inclusion in the syllabus see Browning (1995) 20.

¹⁸ See Wilson (1994) 7: "perhaps it was not his [Photius'] intention to describe books read in all good schools and therefore known to his brother"; cf. also Treadgold (1980) 6–7. For a text suggesting that knowledge of Theocritus' bucolic poems may well have been regarded as minimal in the education of a Greek, see Dain (1956) 198–199 (Greek excerpt on p. 199; for the whole text see Matranga (1850) vol. 2, 675–682).

¹⁹ For the placement of Prodromus first and Macrembolites last, see Beaton (1996)

pirate attacks, banquet scenes, shipwrecks, and enslavements of hero and heroine. None of the settings for these events is rural or pastoral. There are few references or allusions to Theocritus, Moschus, Bion, or Longus—the Greek authors most commonly associated with the bucolic/pastoral—nor are herdsmen ever mentioned. At a central moment in the novel, however, an *ekphrasis* of a cup offers extensive scenes of a rural vintage and of Dionysus frolicking with his satyrs and Bacchantes (4.331–411).²⁰ The question thus arises, Why does Prodromus' novel, which largely leaves out rural and bucolic elements, give such central, extended prominence to descriptions of the vintage and Dionysus?

Prodromus' *ekphrasis* evokes Theocritus' famous cup of *Id.* 1, commonly regarded as a foundational poem of the bucolic. Indeed, the similarities are striking. First, in both texts a lengthy description of a decorated cup is balanced by the performance of a song. In *Id.* 1, Thyrsis' performance of a song about Daphnis follows the description of the cup; in Prodromus, an entertainer's performance of a hymn to Helios precedes the description of the cup.²¹ Second, both texts feature parallel statements of admiration for the cup. Thus with Theocr. 1.56: αἰπολικὸν θάημα· τέρας κέ τυ θυμὸν ἀτύξαι, "a wondrous sight for goatherds; a marvel that will amaze your heart",²² one may compare Prodromus 4.329–330: καλὸν γὰρ ἦν θέαμα τοῖς θεωμένοις / καὶ τὴν πόσιν παρείχε γλυκερωτέραν, "for it was a beautiful sight to see and made the drink seem sweeter". Statements of admiration are, of course, common in descriptions of works of art.²³ Yet word choice and positioning bring these statements together and strengthen the perception of linkage between the two *ekphraseis*: both statements feature the noun θέαμα/θάημα, "sight", instead of the related (and more common) word θαῦμα, "wonder",²⁴ and in both statements the noun

70, 80–81, 211–212; cf. Angold (1997) 248–249 (Prodromus first). For the placement of Macrembolites first, see MacAlister (1991), Agapitos (1998) 144–148, (2000) 181–185. For useful discussion see also Alexiou (2002) 115–116.

²⁰ On the *ekphrasis* of this cup cf. Labarthe-Postel (2001) 361–362.

²¹ Both *Id.* 1's song and Prodromus' hymn include the theme of power to overturn Nature. On comparisons of the Byzantine emperor with the sun, see Hunger (1965) 97–103, Magdalino (1993) 417–418.

²² All translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

²³ See e.g. Thomas (1983/1999) 95–96, Hunter (1999) 84.

²⁴ Cf. the use of the noun θαῦμα (wonder) at Hom. *Il.* 18.377 (θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι, of Hephaestus' twenty automatous tripods) and [Hes.] *Asp.* 318 (θαῦμα ἰδεῖν, of Heracles' shield). In Prodr. 4.329, the choice of the word θέαμα is emphasized by the use of the

takes up the fifth through seventh syllables of the line, and the principal caesura directly follows. This syllabic/caesural matching is particularly impressive in light of the different metres of the texts: Prodromus' twelve-syllable iambic trimeter versus Theocritus' dactylic hexameter.

The illustrations on Prodromus' cup—scenes of a rural vintage and of Dionysus as lord of the vintage—associate the cup further with the bucolic/pastoral tradition. Imagery and themes in Theocritus' *Id.* 1 and 7 connect Dionysus with seminal moments of bucolic song.²⁵ Longus' pastoral novel, *Daphnis and Chloe*, makes the Theocritean linkages between herdsmen, the vintage, and Dionysus explicit. For example, at vintage-time Longus' herdsmen celebrate a festival of Dionysus and the birth of wine (2.2.1); herdsmen celebrate the winter Dionysia (3.9–11); the shepherdess Chloe dresses in a Bacchant's fawnskin (1.23.3, cf. 1.15.2); and wine-treaders tease her like satyrs do a Bacchant (2.2.1–2). There are also specific parallels between Prodromus' cup and the vintage represented at the beginning of Longus' Book 2. The rural folks working on the vintage, as represented on Prodromus' cup (4.344–356, 363–364), are engaged in the sort of activities (gathering the crop, cutting clusters from the vines, putting them into baskets, pressing the grapes) that follow those of Longus' rural folks preparing for the vintage (2.1: readying wine presses, cleaning wine jars, making baskets, providing hooks to cut the clusters). In Longus mention of a vintage celebration of Dionysus follows, with women flirting with Daphnis, comparing him to Dionysus, and one “inamorata” even kissing him (2.2.1–2). On Prodromus' cup, representations of Dionysus (as lord of the vintage) follow, with Bacchantes frolicking about him (4.397–411), and one kissing him (405–406).

Achilles Tatius' novel offers another model for Prodromus' cup. A rock-crystal, decorated mixing-bowl is featured at a dinner party celebrating a festival of Dionysus (2.3). As in the case of Prodromus' cup, the decorations on Achilles Tatius' bowl include Dionysus represented

corresponding verbal form *θεωμένοις* at line's end (thus each of the line's two parts, divided by the caesura, ends with a *θέαμα* word).

²⁵ As Hunter comments (1999) 198, on l. 154: “in Idyll 7, therefore, no less than in Idyll 1, the production of ‘bucolic’ is closely linked to Dionysus”. For discussion see Hunter (1999) 62, 74 on l. 19, 78 on ll. 29–31, 198 on l. 154, 196 on ll. 148–155; see also Gutzwiller (1986). On the association of Dionysus with Pan, see Hunter (1999) 62; on the linkage in visual art see Borgeaud (1988) 55, 178, 212 on ll. 100–102, 261 on l. 26; also, e.g., Carpenter (1991) fig. 135, Bowersock (1990) 52–53, with plates 10–11.

near the grape clusters “that he may cultivate the vine for wine” (2.3.2; cf. Prodrōmus 4.365–370, 389–392). Thus the costliness, illustrations (Dionysus and the vintage), and occasion (a dinner party) of Prodrōmus’ gemstone cup all parallel Achilles Tatius’ rock-crystal bowl.²⁶ Prodrōmus’ *ekphrasis* is thus evocative of multiple texts, most notably Theocritus and Achilles Tatius, but also Longus. Yet these *ekphraseis* vary considerably in length, and the one in Achilles Tatius is quite brief. Prodrōmus’ more extended *ekphrasis* for his cup deserves, then, additional consideration, as does the elaborate prominence it gives the pagan god Dionysus.

In the ancient Greek world, festivals celebrating Dionysus were frequent and visual representations popular, particularly on wine vessels but also in other media.²⁷ During the period of early Christianity, Dionysus’ easy association with wine-miracles and resurrection helped keep his imagery and popular worship visible.²⁸ Yet early Christians were also wary of the association of wine and nature imagery with pagan cults.²⁹ In 691/92 AD, the council in Trullo passed canon 62,³⁰ which along with a general edict against dancing in association with pagan gods, forbade the invocation of Dionysus in connection with the vintage:

ἔτι μὴν καὶ τὰς ὀνόματι τῶν παρ’ Ἑλλήσι ψευδῶς ὀνομασθέντων θεῶν ἢ ἐξ ἀνδρῶν ἢ γυναικῶν γενομένας ὀρχήσεις καὶ τελετὰς κατὰ τι ἔθος παλαιὸν καὶ ἀλλότριον τοῦ τῶν Χριστιανῶν βίου ἀποπεμπόμεθα, ὀρίζοντες ... μῆτε τὸ τοῦ βδελυκτοῦ Διονύσου ὄνομα τὴν σταφυλὴν ἀποθλίβοντας ἐν ταῖς ληνοῖς ἐπιβοᾶν μηδὲ τὸν οἶνον ἐν τοῖς πίθοις ἐπιχέοντας, ἀγνοίας τρόπῳ ἢ ματαιότητι τὰ τῆς μανιώδους πλάνης ἐνεργοῦντας.

Moreover we drive away from the life of Christians the dances and rites given in the names of those falsely called gods by the Greeks whether

²⁶ Before describing the mixing bowl, Clitophon’s narrative includes the tale of the origin of the vintage festival, a story of Dionysus’ original gift of wine to a herdsman (Achilles Tat. 2.2)—which further underscores the linkages between herdsmen, Dionysus, and the vintage.

²⁷ See Carpenter (1986, 1997). For Dionysiac imagery of the vintage: Carpenter (1986) 38 n. 21, 86, 92–94. On how “Dionysus was a particularly favoured Hellenistic deity”, see Smith (1991) 127–140 (quotation from p. 127).

²⁸ On Dionysus’ popularity in late antiquity, see Bowersock (1990) 41–53; on “Dionysus as a precursor of Christological imagery” see Allen (1990) 15–18 (quotation from p. 15).

²⁹ See Maguire (1993), esp. 147–152 (on Christian versus pagan vines, p. 148).

³⁰ This council was convened by the emperor Justinian II to finish the work of the fifth and sixth ecumenical councils. For a useful, brief discussion of canon law, with attention to the council in Trullo, see Hussey (1986) 304–310.

of men or women, and which are performed after an ancient and un-Christian fashion; ... nor may men invoke the name of the execrable Dionysus when they squeeze out the wine in the presses nor when pouring out wine into jars, practising in ignorance and vanity the things which proceed from the deceit of insanity.³¹

From about the 7th to the 11th centuries (and even after), Dionysus rarely appeared in visual or written art in Byzantium.³² Prodrōmus' cup seems deliberately to represent the very world that canon 62 forbids. The cup expressly shows the vintage in association with Dionysus and also Dionysiac dancing (4.355–368):³³

ἄλλοι θλίβοντες τὰς ῥάγας τῶν βοτρυῶν
τὸν οἶνον ἐξίκαζον εἰς ληνὸν μέσην,
ἄλλοι τὸν οἶνον ἐν σμικροῖς κεραμίοις
λαβόντες ἀντέβαλλον εἰς νέους πίθους.
...
πλεξάμενοι δὲ τοὺς ἑαυτῶν δακτύλους
χορὸν ξυνίστων, λίθινοι χοροστάται.
...
καὶ που ξυνελθεῖν καὶ ξυνεμπλέξαι χεῖρα
καὶ ξυγχορεύσειν ἔσχατος ἂν σφοδρὸν πόθον.
Διόνυσος δέ, τοῦ τρυγους ὁ προοστάτης,
πίθου νεαροῦ προ(σ)καθιζήσας στόμα,
Βάκχαις σὺν αὐταῖς καὶ μετ' αὐτῶν Σατύρων
ἔπαιζεν, ὥσπερ τὰ πρέποντα τῷ τρύγει.

some were pressing the grapes and sending forth the wine into the vat. Others were taking the wine in small jars and pouring it in turn into new, large jars ... And intertwining their fingers, they were forming a choir, these dancers of stone, ... and I think you'd have wanted to unite with them, join hands, and participate in the dance. Dionysus, the patron of the vintage, was sitting on the mouth of a new wine-jar and playing together with Bacchantes and satyrs games appropriate, as it were, to a grape harvest.

³¹ Trans. Percival (1900); rev. Greek text: Mansi ((1765) vol. 11, 972b; see also Henrichs (1978) 158 n. 117, Rhalles-Potles (1852) 2, 448 (with Byzantine commentary, 448–452). For discussion cf. Henrichs (1984) 213.

³² See *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, s.v. "Dionysos" (A. Kazhdan-A. Cutler-A. M. Talbot), Allen (1990) 18. But see also the 10th-cent. Veroli ivory casket (Evans-Wixom (1997) 230–231, Beckwith (1962), Weitzmann (1951) *passim*). Byzantine emperors could be insulted when compared to Dionysus: see, e.g., *PG* vol. 109, 216A, 268A (Michael III, 9th century; for discussion in connection with "the subversive ivory and bone plaques that decorated tenth-century Byzantine boxes", see Maguire (1997) 186); Nicetas Choniates, *Hist.* 321.24–26 Diēten (Andronicus I Comnenus, 12th century).

³³ I follow the order of the lines given in Marcovich (1992).

Prodromus' cup brings Dionysus boldly and vividly to life (4.381–396)—“a young boy”, in appearance “like a maiden”, with moist, smiling lips, and so forth. No other god in the novel—including Hermes, the principal patron of the hero and heroine—is given such a detailed physical description. Further, Prodromus underscores Dionysus' linkage with the vintage: he wears a robe “girded up to his knees, as suits men who tread the wine-vat”, and has his arm “nude to the elbow, as is fitting for a man working at a vintage” (4.389–392). The theme of a vintage dance is also emphatically repeated. First, the narrator stresses the life-like realism of the cup by specifically asserting that a viewer would have wanted to join the dance (4.361–362: “I think you'd have wanted to unite with them, join hands, and participate in the dance”). Then the *ekphrasis* of the cup ends with the Bacchantes rousing Dionysus to dance with them (4.397–411). Thus Prodromus' extensive descriptions of vintage festivities on the cup seem to challenge canon 62's specific proscriptions against Dionysiac dancing.

An *ekphrasis* of a cup, including one with erotic overtones, might seem more appropriate, say, in the context of the dinner that takes place at the merchant's house earlier in the novel—a lighter occasion where there is love play involving wine-cups (2.141–149; cf. 120–125). Thus, the placement of this cup instead at a tense pirate's feast deserves additional comment. At the feast, the cup functions as a prestige item in a negotiation of power and intimidation between enemies.³⁴ On the metaliterary level, the transgressive cup might also be suggestive of possible dangers inherent in reviving past genres, with their pagan gods and rituals. Of course, in the context of the war that will shortly break out (the host and guest representing the two sides), a reminder of peacetime activities on a decorated object is not unusual.³⁵ But in the case of Prodromus' cup, the emphasis on peacetime activities that would violate canon law is of special interest.

Prodromus describes the cup only after the drunken guest has dropped and broken it. The question then arises: Why break the cup? Elsewhere I approach this question in terms of the author's innovation in writing a revivalist novel.³⁶ Certainly the breaking of the cup

³⁴ On how “lavish diplomatic receptions at the palace ... were used by the Byzantines as a means of impressing, and intimidating, the foreign visitors”, see Simeonova (2000) 230–231.

³⁵ Cf. the decorations on Achilles' shield, which include a vintage (Hom. *Il.* 18.561–572) along with other peacetime (as well as wartime) activities.

³⁶ Burton, “Byzantine Readers” (forthcoming). There I discuss how the shattering of

(the shattering of the joyous activity represented there) can signify the breaking of the peace and foreshadow the fighting. Here my focus is on how the Dionysiac activities on the cup might challenge orthodox, religious sensibilities. Prodrômus suggests that a viewer seeing the dancers on the cup would have “wanted to unite with them, join hands, and participate in the dance” (4.361–362). After canon 62, were there to exist (even in fiction) a cup arousing a desire among Byzantine viewers to join in a vintage dance in honor of Dionysus, it might be best to break the cup. Thus an author could defy a religious prohibition (in fiction) and then protect himself by destroying the offending artifact (a fictive iconoclasm). After the breaking of the cup, Dionysus is no more to be found in the novel, nor is there further mention of the vintage.

Thus Prodrômus’ novel, despite a general absence of the bucolic/pastoral, includes a major episode engaging not only with past literature but also the contemporary religious world. Despite the interdictions of canon 62 of the council in Trullo, his novel expressly reconnects the ancient, unruly god Dionysus with the vintage, dancing, and merriment. Yet by breaking the cup with the exuberant illustrations of Dionysus and vintage, Prodrômus can deflect a possible official response to his project. Thus the cup passage is evocative of contemporary (and enduring) Byzantine issues related to censorship and worship.

2. *Eugenianus*

Eugenianus’ *Drosilla and Charicles* both follows Prodrômus’ chronologically and engages directly with his themes and imagery. Eugenianus’ novel distinguishes itself from Prodrômus’ by its profusion of pastoral allusions, motifs, and themes, as well as its extensive descriptions of country landscapes, sacred meadows, and gardens. Further, Eugenianus’ novel resurrects Dionysus from the broken pieces of Prodrômus’ cup to become the principal patron of his hero and heroine. In light of long-standing official disapproval of mentioning Dionysus in connec-

this cup, followed by the elaborate description of its engravings as alive, can work as a symbol for the project of reviving the novel: the need to break with the past in order to recreate it, to give it new life.

tion with the vintage, as discussed above, and also the censorious nature of the 12th-cent. orthodox church,³⁷ this would have been a bold move.

The novel includes lengthy descriptions of two festivals of Dionysus: one held just outside the walls of the hero and heroine's hometown of Phthia (3.61–351); and the other outside the walls of Barzon, a town where the hero and heroine find temporary refuge during their wanderings (1.77–158). Both Dionysus festivals feature dancing (as did Prodrōmus' cup), and at both festivals the heroine is the star dancer. The dancing theme is, in fact, strongly associated with Dionysus throughout Eugenianus' novel. First, the hero falls in love with the heroine when he sees her dancing at the Festival of Dionysus in Phthia (3.333–338). The heroine dances again at the Festival of Dionysus in Barzon (1.116–119, 150–151). Later, during a celebration of the hero and heroine's reunion, an old woman dances "with" Dionysus (7.268), and her dance evokes laughter from her guests (7.272–328). Finally, in deflecting one of the hero's attempts at seduction, the heroine expresses a desire to return to Phthia and dance for Dionysus before they marry (8.154–160). Eugenianus' prominent, detailed representations of Dionysiac festivals, merriment, and dancing seem also (as in the case of Prodrōmus' cup) opposed to the repressive attitudes underlying such canons as 62.³⁸

Eugenianus introduces a variation on the narrative technique of *in medias res* as borrowed from Prodrōmus (and tracing back through Heliodorus to Homer). The novel opens with a description of the terrible destruction of the countryside outside Barzon.³⁹ Directly afterwards, the narrator describes the pleasant meadow and festival that the Parthians destroyed when they attacked Barzon (1.77–119); the heroine too is described as she appeared while dancing at that festival (1.120–158). This technique of describing the destruction first and only later describing the events that led to it is not new; Heliodorus opens with the remains of bloody combat on a seashore and only much later does the reader discover what had happened there. But Eugenianus' variation on the technique of *in medias res* is strikingly parallel to Prodrōmus' new pattern of describing the decorated cup only after it is broken (but

³⁷ On the increase in heresy trials under Manuel I Comnenus, see Magdalino (1993) esp. 276–281.

³⁸ Canon 62 also expresses a desire specifically to abolish "the public dances of women"; Eugenianus' novel prominently features women's public dances.

³⁹ See e.g. 1.26–27 (the destruction of fruit trees), 36–41 (the destruction of corn and grape crops), and 28–29 (the capture of goats and cows). Cf. Prodr. 1.11 (the destruction of grapevines).

directly after). Similarly Eugenianus describes first the destruction of Barzon and then (immediately) the peaceful world that was destroyed. Insofar as this lost world included festivities in honor of Dionysus, it could represent Prodromus' cup come to life, as it were, with a living festival of Dionysus, including dancers.

A second festival of Dionysus provides the most striking evocation of a bucolic/pastoral landscape in Eugenianus' novel. When in prison, the hero tells the story of how he first saw the heroine at a Festival of Dionysus held in the countryside outside his hometown of Phthia. The landscape the hero describes is emphatically bucolic, including both herdsmen and Golden Age motifs (3.65–96). The activities of the festival combine both urban and bucolic motifs. As in Theocritus' *Id.* 7, city folks leave the city to attend a festival in the countryside. The hero and his male friends find a plane tree in a sacred space and sit beneath it to view the girls (3.109–113). From this vantage, they engage in a kind of song competition (3.128–322). Their songs principally evoke a world of playful (urban) love and an epigrammatic past, but the activity of a seemingly extemporaneous exchange of songs of love in the countryside is also evocative of Theocritean 'song-competition'.⁴⁰

The detail of the plane tree with a stream flowing nearby (3.83–91) sets up additional resonances. Charicles compares the plane tree directly to Xerxes' famous golden plane-tree.⁴¹ Yet the circumstances evoke Plato's *Phaedrus*. In Eugenianus' novel, Charicles and his friends left the city (to attend a festival), sat under a plane tree near a river (in a sanctuary of Dionysus), and exchanged tales of love. Similarly in Plato's *Phaedrus* male companions leave the city for the countryside, sit under a plane tree near a stream (seemingly in a sanctuary of Achelous and the nymphs), and exchange stories of love.⁴²

The last entrant in the boys' singing 'contest' (and the only named singer), Barbition, sings two hexameter songs with Theocritean refrains

⁴⁰ On the aspect of exchange in Theocritean 'bucolicising', see Hunter (1999) esp. 6–8, who notes that "in *Idyll* 5 "bucolicising" clearly means competing in an exchange of extemporised verses" (p. 6) and "in *Idyll* 7 "bucolicising" involves an exchange of songs" (p. 7). See also Pretagostini, this volume, pp. 55–63.

⁴¹ For the story of Xerxes' plane tree, see Herod. 7.31 (in both Herodotus and Eugen. 3.97–100, a guard watches over the plane tree).

⁴² On how the *Phaedrus* sets up "a privileged *locus* ... specifically for the exchange of competing views of *eros*", see Hunter (1999) 14. On pastoral qualities of Plato's *Phaedrus*, see Gutzwiller (1991) 73–79, Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi-Hunter (2004) 143–145, 147–148. For references in ancient and Byzantine literature see Nilsson (2001) 181–186; also Trapp (1990).

(3.263–288, 297–322).⁴³ In a novel written otherwise in iambic trimeters, two hexameter songs reminiscent of Theocritus are inserted here.⁴⁴ Like Lycidas in Theocr. *Id.* 7, the figure of Barbiton (whose name means “lyre”) seems emblematic, a personification of past (pagan) song traditions. His two songs are drawn from the mythical past: the first song, a story of Rhodope and Euthynicus; the second, of Pan and Syrinx, whose story includes the invention of the panpipe and hence bucolic song.⁴⁵ Barbiton’s version of the story of Pan and Syrinx differentiates itself from both Longus’ and Achilles Tatius’ versions by adding a specifically Theocritean detail to the creation of the pipes (3.309–310): “his [Pan’s] breath entered a reed and produced a sweet song, which is a remedy for love” (cf. Theocr. 11.17–18). Further, Eugenianus’ echo of Theocritus’ famous expressions of unreciprocated love—Eugen. 3.311: “and you, do you hate the lover and not desire me who desires you?” (cf. Theocr. 6.17: “she flies the wooer, and when one woos not, follows” and 11.75: “why pursue him that flees?”⁴⁶)—strengthens the song’s Theocritean flavor. Barbiton also offers a possible self-reflective vignette of author as urbane, accomplished singer. Like Barbiton, the novelist too displays virtuosity by presenting, in the midst of a novel written in twelve-syllable iambic-trimeter verse, two hexameter songs.

The novel balances the bucolic model of obsessive, unreciprocated love (like Pan’s for Syrinx) against the novelistic model of passionate, reciprocal love. Taking his companions’ songs as *exempla*, the hero concludes that love means suffering (a Theocritean theme).⁴⁷ Feeling isolated from his companions, overcome by obsessive love, the hero runs home. Love has shattered the fun of the festival for him, as well as the bucolic peace he first described. The behavior of the hero here also seems reflective of Theocritean bucolic: the theme of obsessive, unre-

⁴³ Both of Barbiton’s songs include learned allusions to Theocritus’ poems. For example, Barbiton, in describing an act of consummation (3.284: ἔργον δ’ ἐκτετέλεστο, καὶ ἐξ πόθον ἦλυθον ἄμφω, “the deed was accomplished, and they both came to their desire”), borrows from Theocr. 2.143 (ἐπράχθη τὰ μέγιστα, καὶ ἐξ πόθον ἦνθομεν ἄμφω). Eugenianus’ gloss in the next line (3.285: “she gave up her insufferable virginity by compulsion of Eros”) may suggest suspicion of possible ambiguity at *Id.* 2.143 (on the meaning “we attained our desires” vs “we became desirous”, see Gow (1952) vol. 2, 59–60 on l. 143).

⁴⁴ There is one other instance of hexameter verse in Eugenianus’ novel: a lament at 6.205–235.

⁴⁵ For the story of Pan and Syrinx, cf. Longus 2.34; Achilles Tat. 8.6.7–10.

⁴⁶ Both trans. by Gow (1952) vol. 1, 53 and 91.

⁴⁷ Eugen. 3.339–342. Cf. the use of songs as *exempla* in Theocr. *Id.* 11 and 13.

quited love breaking into the quiet of a countryside; of amatory distress isolating humans from bucolic peace and also from other denizens of the bucolic (such as herd animals).

Id. 1's legendary pastoral singer Daphnis (also emblematic of Theocritean erotic suffering) figures prominently in Eugenianus' novel. The first reference occurs as follows: The hero and heroine, Drosilla and Charicles, captured by the Parthians, are serving as personal slaves of the Parthian prince, Cleinias, and the Parthian queen. Cleinias, in love with the heroine, contemplates his love in a lengthy self-address (4.105–219). When the hero offers to act as his go-between in courtship (4.289–290), Cleinias eagerly accepts. Cleinias' love message to the heroine is modeled on Daphnis' famous passage of *adynata* in *Id.* 1: see Eugen. 4.300–309:

... σύντομον λόγον μάθε·
 Ἄιδης συναρπάξει με καὶ πρὸ τοῦ χρόνου,
 ὁ λαμπρὸς αὐτὸς ἀστεράρχης φωσφόρος
 ἔδυνέ μοι τοῖς πᾶσιν ἀκτίνας βρῦων.
 Πηγαὶ ποταμῶν συγκινεῖσθωσαν ἄνω·
 θνήσκω γὰρ ὡς μόρσιμος, ἀλλὰ πρὸ χρόνου·
 ἀνθηράτω καὶ βᾶτος ἡδύπνουν ῥόδον·
 γένοιτο πάντα νῦν ἐναλλάξ ἐν βίῳ,
 τοῦ Κλεινίου θνήσκοντος, εἰ μὴ προφθάσει
 ἡ σή, Χαρίκλεις, εἰς τὸ σῶσαι στερρότης.

Here's a brief description of what to say. Hades is seizing me before my time. The bright sun himself, leader of the stars, who sends forth rays to all, has set for me. Let rivers flow back to their sources, for I am dying as destined, but before time. Let the bramble-bush too bloom with the fragrant rose. Let all things now be changed in the world since Cleinias dies—unless you save him first, Charicles, with your strength.⁴⁸

Daphnis' speech of self-obsessed bravado (Theocr. 1.130, 132–136) is hardly an auspicious model for courting a young maiden.⁴⁹ On a met-aliterary level, by putting Daphnis' *adynaton* passage in Cleinias' mouth, Eugenianus may be suggesting the exaggeration in Daphnis' own self-representation in *Id.* 1.⁵⁰ In addition, the inappropriateness of Cleinias'

⁴⁸ All translations of Eugenianus' novel are taken from Burton (2004).

⁴⁹ Cf. Walsh (1985) 5: "[the *adynaton* figure] has no point except as a measure of his [Daphnis'] outraged moral feelings". For fictive characters not in control of their own references or *exempla*, see also e.g. Theocr. 3.40–51 (Fantuzzi (1995) 22–29).

⁵⁰ Cf. Hunter (1999) 103 on ll. 132–136: "Daphnis' death is not in fact *contra naturam*, but his obsessive concern with his own position places him, in his own eyes, at the very centre of the natural order".

model for his love message may characterize Cleinias as a naive reader of past literature (he remembers Daphnis simply as suffering “for love”, not Daphnis’ defiance of love).⁵¹ This could be regarded as very ‘Theocritean’.⁵²

Charicles responds to Cleinias’ self-involved message by telling him a story of Aphrodite’s response to Eros’ complaint that a bee sting has killed him (4.313–324). The interplay between this story, Cleinias’ love message, and past texts offers another example of Eugenianus’ sophisticated interplay with past literature (including bucolic). This story works in Eugenianus on several levels. First, for Charicles to tell this tale in response to Cleinias’ *adynaton* passage suggests amusement at the contents of Cleinias’ love message. Like Cleinias, Eros overdramatizes his plight and employs extravagant nature-imagery with amusing abandon.

Eugenianus models Charicles’ story of the bee sting principally after *Anacr.* 35. In both Charicles’ story and *Anacr.* 35 (but not in the related ps.-Theocritean *Id.* 19), Eros does not notice a bee sleeping among the roses; he complains to Aphrodite of his imminent death by bee sting; he describes the stinging beast as a small, winged snake (with the added ‘scholarly’ gloss that farmers call it a “bee”); and Aphrodite asks what Eros thinks his own victims must suffer, if he regards a bee sting as so painful.

Eugenianus adds the detail of Aphrodite’s laughter as she speaks, which is absent from *Anacr.* 35 but present in the ps.-Theocritean *Id.* 19.⁵³ Thus Eugenianus’ version echoes at least these two models. The exchange of message and story between Cleinias and Charicles also functions like a bucolic song exchange: in response to Cleinias’ Theocritean passage of Daphnis, Charicles narrates an anacreontic story of Eros. By having the hero and the prince draw on different literary sources, Eugenianus can also highlight differences in the approaches to love represented by these different literary kinds.

⁵¹ On how “in this novel, the ‘best’ man, the one who wins the girl, is also the more sophisticated and erudite reader”, see Burton (2003) 253–262 (quotation from 262).

⁵² For example, on *Id.* 2’s Simaetha as naive reader, see Griffiths (1979), Segal (1984); but cf. Andrews (1996).

⁵³ Rosenmeyer (1992) 175–176 regards the element of Aphrodite’s laughter as crucial: “in the pastoral [ps.-Theocr. *Id.* 19], Aphrodite’s laughter adds to the charm of the scene ... The anacreontic ‘lovely Cytherean’ merely speaks ... The same sequence of events seems violent and arbitrary in one manifestation [*Anacr.* 35], but playful and charming in the other” (quotation from p. 175). Cf. Crane (1987) 168–169.

Yet Eugenianus' version adds an adverb to Aphrodite's laugh (Aphrodite's laughter is unmodified in the ps.-Theocritean *Id.* 19). The addition of the qualifier makes Eugenianus' version also reminiscent of Aphrodite's famous laughter in Theocritus' *Id.* 1. Thus Eugen. 4.320–321: ἀλλ' ἡ καλὴ Κυθήρη τῷ πεπληγμένῳ / ἀστεῖον ἐγγελῶσα λοιπὸν ἀντέρη, “but beautiful Cythera, with an amused laugh, then replied to her son who'd been stung”. Compare Theocr. 1.95–97 ἦνθέ γε μὰν ἀδεῖα καὶ ἁ Κύπρις γελάοισα, / λάθρη μὲν γελάοισα, βαρὺν δ' ἀνὰ θυμὸν ἔχοισα, / κείπε, κτλ., “and Cypris too came to see him, laughing with delight, but laughing in secret, feigning a heavy heart, and said ...”.⁵⁴ In both cases, the first line refers to Aphrodite with a name related to an island (and starting with a kappa), and the second line begins with an adverb followed by a participial form of the verb γελᾶν, “to laugh”—the phrase modifying the first line's subject, Aphrodite. Further, in both cases, the participle occupies the fourth through seventh syllables, and the principal caesura follows. Similarities in context strengthen these structural and verbal linkages. Theocritus' Aphrodite is responding to Daphnis' suffering, and Eugenianus' Charicles is responding to Cleinias' self-presentation as a suffering “Daphnis” (through imitation of *Id.* 1's *adynaton* passage).

In Eugenianus' version, the word ἀστεῖος, “witty”, “charming”, suggests a certain tone to Aphrodite's laughter in the story (amused, indulgent?). Through this word and its reflection back on Charicles' own response to Cleinias, Charicles can characterize himself as the kind of urbane go-between a prince might want. By having Charicles respond to Cleinias with an amusing story, the author shows a way in which a subordinate person might offer a critique to his master. But by having Aphrodite's laughter also recall her laughter in Theocritus' *Id.* 1, Eugenianus complicates such a picture. The quality of Aphrodite's laughter at *Id.* 1.95–96 is an enduring crux: scholarly interpretations are divided, with Aphrodite alternately hiding indulgence (or mockery) and displaying anger (or grief); or displaying mockery (or indulgence) and hiding grief (or anger).⁵⁵ The ambiguity of Aphrodite's response provides a larger context for a difficult emotional moment for Charicles: asked to act as go-between for a proposal that would destroy his relationship with his beloved, Charicles tries to be charming and witty. Yet, as in the

⁵⁴ Trans. by Verity (2002) 4, with modifications.

⁵⁵ For discussion see e.g. Gow (1952) vol. 2, 21–22 on l. 96, Crane (1987), Cameron (1995) 413, Hunter (1999) 94–95 on ll. 95–96; cf. Σb 1.95–98 (p. 62 Wendel).

case of Aphrodite's response to Daphnis in *Id.* 1, Charicles' response to Cleinias is ambiguous, with his surface response masking other emotional feelings beneath.

Thus this passage exemplifies Eugenianus' subtlety and predilection for multiple allusion and conflation of models.⁵⁶ Through Aphrodite's laughter, Eugenianus can suggest a critique of Cleinias' self-construction as Daphnis and also of Daphnis' own self-dramatization in *Id.* 1. Eugenianus' use of the story of Eros as a response to an imitation of Daphnis' *adynaton* also suggests that the author may regard the story's models—*Anacreontea* 35 and ps.-Theocr. *Id.* 19—as taking sides regarding Aphrodite's response to Daphnis (with *Id.* 19 highlighting Aphrodite's amusement and *Anacr.* 35, according to Patricia A. Rosenmeyer, focusing on Aphrodite's harshness). But are such allusions meant to be shared only between author and external audience? The allusions might also help to characterize Charicles and Cleinias as different kinds of readers of past literature. The inappropriateness of Cleinias' use of Daphnis' *adynaton* passage for his love message is suggestive of Cleinias' lack of sophistication as a reader. The scene that follows suggests that Charicles, in contrast, is being characterized as self-ironical and sophisticated in reading past literature.

When the Parthian prince, Cleinias, sends his slave Charicles with a love message to the heroine, Drosilla, Charicles finds her sleeping in a meadow and utters a soliloquy over her (4.332–413). The setting and circumstance of this encounter specifically recall Daphnis discovering Chloe asleep and uttering a soliloquy over her in Longus' pastoral novel (1.25). That Charicles should be placed in a Longan episode underscores the difference between himself and Cleinias: Cleinias' love, like that of a suffering Theocritean character, is doomed to be unidirectional, but Charicles can aspire to the reciprocity of love enjoyed by Daphnis and Chloe.

Yet this episode too conflates multiple literary models; in particular, it moves beyond Longus' pastoral novel to recall Longus' source, Theocritus. Thus when Charicles contemplates the possibility of flies bothering the breast of the sleeping girl, rather than imitate Longus' Daphnis (who takes such an excuse to reach down Chloe's dress, 1.26), he recalls a famous passage from Theocr. *Id.* 11: see Eugen. 4.379–380: Ἐρωτος οὐδὲν ἄλλο φάρμακον ξένον / ὧδὴ δέ τις καὶ μοῦσα παῦλα

⁵⁶ On "conflation, or multiple reference" see Thomas (1986/1999) 135–141 (quotation from p. 135).

τῶν πόνων, “there is no other strange remedy for love: song and music alone offer a rest from love’s cares”. In so characterizing the power of song, he recalls Theocritus’ lovelorn Cyclops, but Charicles reads the meaning of the Cyclops poem from the vantage of the authorial frame. Charicles’ interpretation of the Theocritean crux is clear and succinct: Charicles understands the song to be a temporary relief (not a cure). The expression of such a sentiment could have also returned Charicles to Longus 2.7.7.⁵⁷ Through Charicles, Eugenianus brings Longus and Theocritus into dialogue again. But rather than engage with the Longan text suggesting the possibility of a cure for love, Charicles (Eugen. 4.387–391) instead echoes the famous Longan claim that no one has ever escaped love or ever will “as long as beauty exists, and eyes can see”⁵⁸ (Longus, *Proem* 4). Eugenianus is fond of this Longan assertion; later in the novel, he has another lover echo it again (6.367–370). Such a sentiment opens up an endless vista, in both directions, of lovers who have gone before and will come after. This is the belated world in which Eugenianus’ characters find themselves; they know these things have been said and felt before and will be said and felt again. They acknowledge the weight of the past, of tradition, as well as the difficulty of originality in love, in poetry, in life. There is pleasure in all this intertextuality, the pleasure of recognition, of memory. All the characters do this. Eugenianus simply has some characters do it more successfully (that is, with more self-awareness, more self-irony) than others. The difference also is that some characters, at select moments, rise from their text-bound characters to enter the realm of literary criticism, to aspire to become authors of their own roles.

In a Longan meadow, Charicles looks to Theocritus to express the torment of his love. He starts with the solution of the Theocritean Cyclops—to sing, to lament to himself—which for a time brings respite. Charicles slips back to Longus’ pretty pastoral world as a result, fostering for a moment the idea of Eros’ link with beauty. But Book 4 ends with Charicles turning away from the solace of Longus’ prologue to string together a series of images of love drawn from Theocritus’ most desolate moments: *Id.* 2’s jilted Simaetha complaining that Eros,

⁵⁷ Longus 2.7.7: “there is no medicine (φάρμακον) for Love, no potion, no drug, no spell to mutter, except a kiss and an embrace and lying down together with naked bodies”, trans. Gill (1989) 306; cf., however, the prologue’s claim that Longus’ novel “will cure [ἰάσεται] the sick, comfort the distressed”, *Proem* 3, trans. Gill (1989) 289. For further discussion see Burton (2003) 253–255.

⁵⁸ Trans. by Gill (1989) 289.

like a marsh leech, has drunk all her blood (Eugen. 4.399–401; cf. Theocr. 2.55–56); *Id.* 14's jilted Aeschinas complaining that he is "like a mouse caught in pitch" (Eugen. 4.408–410; cf. Theocr. 14.51); the Theocritean images come quickly on each other now. The book ends with Charicles echoing the lines of *Id.* 30's despairing, aging pederastic lover as he compares the hopelessness of trying to vanquish Eros to counting stars in the sky (Eugen. 4.411–413; cf. Theocr. 30.25–27). Thus Book 4 ends with Charicles' seeming descent into a Theocritean lover's depression—self-aware, self-ironical, but no less unhappy for that.

Eugenianus' lovers suffer from mood swings, as literary lovers generally do; Book 5 begins with Drosilla waking up, and Charicles' depression lifts—even Zeus delights in seeing "a rosy girl when she awakes from sleep about midday" (5.16–17). The pastoral interlude continues as they discuss together, still in the Longan meadow, what they should do to escape their captors—hero and heroine absorbed (mutually) in their mutual love, suffering, and plight. In literature as in life, country landscapes can serve as places of ease and peace. In Latin elegiac poetry, the motif of a bucolic refuge for love becomes defining for such writers as Propertius and Ovid.⁵⁹ Similarly, in Longus' pastoral novel, the countryside serves as a retreat for wealthy city folk and also represents for them a place of easy love (e.g., for Gnathon). It is also common in literature for the *locus amoenus* to become a place of danger (as in the case of Europa, Io, Persephone). In both Eugenianus and Macrembolites, even in the most dire of circumstances (when hero and heroine are enslaved), pleasant country-landscapes and gardens regularly provide sites for lovers' encounters.⁶⁰

A fictive inn-keeper's son, Callidemus, brings the theme of intertextuality with past literature explicitly into the fictive world of the characters. An inn naturally functions as a place of meetings, where recognitions and reunions can take place. But although the hero lodges temporarily within, the innkeeper's son, a rival for the heroine's affections, functions as a gatekeeper, blocking the reunion between hero and heroine. The heroine stays instead with an old woman, a Hecale figure,⁶¹ who gives her hospitality. Callidemus woos the heroine by citing famous

⁵⁹ For discussion (in connection with Bion), see Fantuzzi (2003), and Fantuzzi in Fantuzzi-Hunter (2004) 173–190.

⁶⁰ Prodromus has only one erotic encounter in a verdant landscape, a vineyard close by a merchant's house in which hero and heroine are guests (3.47–78). On the garden as "the scene for erotic action", see Littlewood (1979) esp. 97–98 (quotation from p. 97).

⁶¹ On Callimachus' *Hecale* in the Byzantine period, see Hollis (1990) 37–40.

couples of past literature; his list includes Longus' Daphnis and Chloe, Musaeus' Hero and Leander, and Theocritus' Cyclops and Galatea. Eugenianus' novel is the first extant Greek novel to make direct and explicit reference to other novels. Although Callidemus briefly mentions two inappropriate 'couples' from Heliodorus' novel (Eugen. 6.389–390),⁶² pride of place among novels is given to a summary of the reciprocated love of Longus' Daphnis and Chloe (6.440–453). Yet for his own courtship behavior Callidemus borrows instead from Theocritus' amorous Cyclops (*Id.* 6.503–554), a tactic that does not work well for him. Like the laughing girls in Theocritus' *Id.* 11 (ll. 77–78), Drosilla seems less than impressed with Callidemus' Cyclopean advances.⁶³

The hero and heroine's friend from prison, Cleandrus, like other Eugenianan characters, draws occasionally from bucolic/pastoral literature. Originally from Lesbos (the setting of Longus' pastoral novel), he is a typical urban hero, born from "noble, honorable parents" (2.58). While telling Charicles the story of falling in love with the girl next door, who was kept respectably secluded, Cleandrus echoes a Longan phrase (regarding the arousal of old men) in describing the girl's beauty (2.81–84):

Παῖς ἦν ἐκείνη, παῖς ἀπαλή, παρθένος·
πλὴν δυσκινήτους ἐκ χρόνων ἀμετρίας
γέροντας εἴλκε πρὸς ἔρωτα τῇ θέᾳ,
οὐ πῦρ μόνον πνέοντας εὐζώνους νέους.

she was a girl, a delicate maiden, but her appearance drew even old men (hard to excite due to excessive age) to love—not just ardent, active young men.

Compare Longus' description of the excitement aroused by the sight of he-goats chasing she-goats and mounting them (3.13.3):

καὶ γέροντας ὀρώοντας ἐξώρμησεν εἰς ἀφροδίτην τὰ τοιαῦτα θεάματα· οἱ δὲ νέοι καὶ σφριγῶντες καὶ πολλὸν ἤδη χρόνον ἔρωτα ζητοῦντες ἐξεκάνοντο πρὸς τὰ ἀκούσματα καὶ ἐτήκοντο πρὸς τὰ θεάματα.

even old men would have been excited to desire by such sights. But Daphnis and Chloe, blooming with youthful energy, who had long since

⁶² Arsace (a satrap's wife) and the hero, Theagenes; Achaimenes (Arsace's maid's son) and the heroine, Charicleia—Callidemus introduces them (inappropriately) as examples of reciprocated love (6.386–390).

⁶³ See Eugen. 6.555–556, 574–580, 593–594, 618–619, 628; also 292–301. I treat these topics at more length in Burton (2003) 253–262. On Callidemus' use of *exempla*, cf. Jouanno's important article (1989).

been searching for love, were inflamed by what they heard and felt faint at what they saw.⁶⁴

In both passages, the sense of attraction is amplified through the detail that even old men would feel arousal.⁶⁵ By having Cleandrus reuse a phrase describing the excitement felt at viewing he-goats chasing she-goats (a typical Theocritean example of promiscuous animal-love)⁶⁶ in a description of the arousal of men at the sight of a young girl, Eugenianus may suggest a possible animalistic aspect in Cleandrus' attraction to his beloved.

Later in the novel, in Book 8, Drosilla, the heroine, echoes this same Longan phrase in describing to her beloved how his rival Callidemus, the innkeeper's son, courted her (8.53–58):

ἐγγὺς γὰρ ἐστὼς, ἐκ κεφαλῆς εἰς πόδας
γεωμετρῶν με καὶ πυκνὸν μεταβλέπων
καὶ τὴν πνοὴν ἔοικεν ἐκλελοιπέναι.
εἰ γὰρ τὸ κάλλος δεινὸν ἐστὶν ἐλκύσαι
καὶ τοὺς παρακμάσαντας ἄνδρας πολλάκις,
πόσῳ τὸν ἀκμάζοντα καὶ νεανίαν;

as he stood near, measuring me from head to foot and examining me closely, he seemed to have even lost his breath, for if beauty often can attract even men past their peak, how much more the young man in his prime?

Eugenianus seems to delight in playing with the gender of speakers. Elsewhere I have discussed how he takes passages uttered by males in Theocritus and puts them in female mouths.⁶⁷ In the case of this memorable Longan passage (3.13.3), Eugenianus has first a young swain use it, then a chaste young girl. Eugenianus varies the image according to circumstance and gender. The heroine does not mention “love”, just Callidemus' crude leering (as if gazing at goats mating); Drosilla felt dehumanized—treated like an animal by Callidemus' gaze. Recollection of the Longan passage intensifies that effect.

In Book 8, the hero Charicles' use of birds as models of monogamy and marriage in an attempt to seduce the heroine in a garden (84–90, 125–130) also contrasts with this Longan model. As in Longus, Eugenianus' characters sometimes look for lessons in love from ani-

⁶⁴ Trans. by Gill (1989) 323.

⁶⁵ Cf. the old men gazing on Helen in Hom. *Il.* 3.150–158.

⁶⁶ E.g. Theocr. 1.151–152, 5.147–150.

⁶⁷ Burton (2003) 269–271.

mals, but in Eugenianus fidelity and wedding are the models found (not goats promiscuously mounting one another). This Eugenianan approach contrasts also with Theocritus, whose animals exemplify carelessness, promiscuous love, as opposed to obsessive, unreciprocated love.⁶⁸

Eugenianus has the hero and heroine's friend, Cleandrus, borrow heavily from Theocritean imagery in Book 2, in the fourth and last of a series of courtship letters addressed to his beloved (2.295–303):

ἐκ τῶν ἐκείνου κατεκαύθην ἀνθρώκων.
 ἐξ ἡλίου φλέγοντος ὡς ὁδοιπόρος,
 ὡς σκιερὸν τι δένδρον ἐξεύρηκά σε·
 ὡς κισσὸς εἰς δρυὶν συμπλακείμεν παννύχως.
 εἰπεῖν δέον με τὴν ἀλήθειαν· ὅσον
 χειμῶνός ἐστι κρεῖττον ἐκκρίτως ἔαρ,
 στρουθῶν ἀηδῶν, μῆλον ἢ δὺ βραβύλων,
 ὅσον γυναικῶν τριγάμων ἢ παρθένος,
 τοσοῦτο τὸ πρόσωπον.

I was burnt by his [Eros'] glowing embers. Like a traveler out of the burning sun who finally finds a shady tree, I found you. May I cling to you, like ivy to a tree, all night long. I must tell the truth: just as spring is better by far than winter, nightingale than sparrows, sweet apple than blackthorn plums, a maiden than thrice-married women, so great is your beauty.

These pastoral images come directly from Theocr. 12.3–9.⁶⁹ Cleandrus adopts a bucolic/pastoral mask while wooing. But the pastoral mask later becomes actuality for him.

Eugenianus' second major reference to Theocritus' Daphnis occurs in the context of the tragic and mysteriously sudden death of Cleandrus after he learns of his beloved's death. The narrator depicts his funeral by recalling the grieving herdsmen, the lamentation of Nature—the general pastoral ambiance that surrounds Theocritus' dying Daphnis.⁷⁰ Cleandrus' death contrasts with that of the Parthian prince, Cleinias; the different uses of the figure of Theocritus' Daphnis highlight the difference. Cleinias, who self-dramatizes his love in the manner of *Id.* 1's Daphnis, would not die for love as Cleandrus does (and as

⁶⁸ On how, in Theocritus, "the very proximity of the animals with their uncomplicated mating habits ... throws the emotional suffering of the herdsmen into pathetic relief", see Hunter (1999) 15.

⁶⁹ *Id.* 12 is echoed also at Eugen. 6.62–67 and 452–455; on *Id.* 12's special interest for Eugenianus, see Burton (2003) 269–270, 271–272.

⁷⁰ For discussion of specific linkages see Burton (2003) 263–265.

Hero does); when Cleinias dies, it is during battle and hardly merits mention (5.434–435).⁷¹ Cleandrus, on the other hand, exemplifies the Hero-and-Leander type of love that the inn-keeper's son, Callidemus, talked of (6.473–489) but could not attain: the love that endures beyond death. Cleandrus dies for love within the adventure world: the hero and heroine must leave him there, never to return home. This is the first time in the tradition of the Greek novel that a character actually dies solely of love.⁷² Eugenianus marks the innovation by transporting Callidemus (in death) wholly into the pastoral world. Only by leaving their friend behind can the hero and heroine themselves leave the adventure world, the mirror world, to return to ordinary life—their families and responsibilities.⁷³

To summarize, while echoing Prodromus' novel and engaging with its themes and imagery, Eugenianus' novel distinguishes itself by the abundance of bucolic/pastoral motifs and themes as well as allusions to past bucolic/pastoral literature, particularly to Theocritus and Longus, but also to a number of other related texts, for example, Plato's *Phaedrus*. It includes an effusion of gardens, meadows, and country landscapes. Eugenianus' novel also notably resurrects Dionysus and the theme of Dionysiac dance. It is also the first Greek novel to make direct references to past novels—including a summary of Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*. The character making these references also presents a lengthy reworking of Theocritus' poem featuring the herdsman Polyphemus' love for Galatea. In putting such summaries in the mouth of a fictive character, Eugenianus suggests the possibility of an enduring, though not always discerning readership of past Greek literature. His novel also shows how allusions to past literature can be vital and central to the creation of new, original literature.⁷⁴ His allusions offer sophisticated ways to delineate characters and set up confrontations between past (and contemporary) ideologies of love. Rather than shut out bucolic/pastoral, as Prodromus does with the breaking of the cup, Eugenianus

⁷¹ Cf. Prodromus' pirate Gobryas, who dies in battle with his beloved's name on his lips (the heroine, 6.52–64), and who was vexed at the order to go to war in the midst of his courtship (5.16–22).

⁷² See Burton (2003) 266.

⁷³ For further discussion see Burton (2003) 262–267.

⁷⁴ Parallel practices between the Byzantine novelists and Hellenistic poets include presenting characters not in control of their own allusions, an intense interest in relations with past literature, an emphasis on diminutives, the use of multiple intertexts, and taking polemical stances in scholarly controversies.

defiantly includes it throughout. Eugenianus' extensive network of allusions to past literature shows a way to keep that literature alive, by recasting it, rethinking it, and reworking it in new works of literature.

3. *Macrembolites*

Macrembolites' novel, *Hysmine and Hysminias*, is presented entirely through the first-person narration of Hysminias and takes place mostly within an elite world of luxury homes and gardens.⁷⁵ Hysminias, an unmarried member of one of Eurycomis' elite families, is chosen by lot to serve as a religious herald to the city of Aulicomis. He spends three days there, staying with another elite family in a house with a luxurious garden. Acquaintance with the family's daughter develops into romance. Returning home, he brings the heroine's family with him to stay with his family; as the heroine's family prepares to return home after their visit, the hero and heroine elope (Book 7). A disastrous ship voyage results in separate enslavements to wealthy Greek masters, but in the end the hero and heroine return to be wed in the heroine's family's lavish garden. Specific allusions to past bucolic literature (such as Theocritus and Longus) are rare in comparison with Eugenianus.⁷⁶ Instead, the world of Theocritean bucolic enters this novel almost exclusively in the descriptions of works of art decorating the heroine's family's garden: a fountain featuring a golden eagle and other automatous sculptures, and an abundance of wall paintings. Unlike Eugenianus, who has his characters extensively revive and recall the Theocritean bucolic world throughout his novel, Macrembolites instead mostly isolates the bucolic world in works of art in a luxury garden.⁷⁷ As a form of containment it can be compared with Prodrumus' cup, although Prodrumus takes the additional step of then breaking the cup.

The context for these descriptions of works of art is as follows. At the start of Macrembolites' novel, the hero attends a dinner party in a pri-

⁷⁵ On the "innovation" of Macrembolites' "consistent use of first-person viewpoint", see Alexiou's fundamental article (1977); quotation from p. 30.

⁷⁶ Three notable allusions to Theocr. *Id.* 3: Macremb. 4.3.3 (*Id.* 3.20), 9.4.1 (*Id.* 3.37), 6.3.2 (*Id.* 3.52); see Alexiou (1977) 37. On an allusion to Longus, *Proem* 3 at Macremb. 11.23.1–2 see Agapitos (2000) 183; on reminiscences of Longan gardens in the heroine's family's garden see Nilsson (2001) 208, 210, 212.

⁷⁷ Unlike in Prodrumus' and Eugenianus' novels, pirates or barbarians never invade bucolic or pastoral scenes in Macrembolites' novel.

vate luxury garden attached to the heroine's house. The hero describes the garden as a paradise—he is reminded of Alcinous' garden and the Elysian Plain (1.4.3).⁷⁸ The garden features an elaborate fountain with automatous sculptures including an eagle, a goat drinking from the basin, a goatherd milking the goat, a rustic cup placed beneath the goat's breast, milk leaking from a hole in the cup, a hare drinking water, and various birds "singing" (1.5).⁷⁹ To represent a hare and an eagle as both luxuriating peaceably in the same fountain (the eagle "spreading its wings as if it wished to bathe", 1.5.2–3; cf. 1.5.5) could reinforce the garden's presentation as utopian/paradisiacal by bringing together natural enemies.⁸⁰ The genre scene of a goatherd milking a goat may also contribute to the sense of the garden as a 'pastoral paradise'.⁸¹

Yet these works of art are also emblematic of the sophisticated ways in which the Byzantine novelists were redefining their relationship with past literature. In particular, the statuary depicting a goatherd milking a goat has several points of contact with Theocritus' *Id.* 1. In Macrembolites, the goat has just given birth; a rustic cup is beneath her breast; the cup has a hole in the bottom and milk is running out, but the goatherd seems not to notice. The combined elements of Macrembolites' goatherd (αἰπόλος, 1.5.4) milking a recently-delivered goat (ἄρτιτόκος αἴξ, 1.5.3) and using a rustic cup (κισσύβιον, 1.5.4) specifically recall the gifts *Id.* 1's goatherd (αἰπόλος, e.g., l. 1) gives the shepherd Thyrsis: a rustic cup (κισσύβιον, l. 27) and the right to milk a twin-bearing goat (αἶγα ... διδυματόκον, l. 1.25).⁸²

⁷⁸ On the garden as a paradise, cf. Plepelits (1989) esp. 39–43; on such comparisons see Littlewood (1979) 108–109; on Alcinous' garden as a "seasonless paradise", cf. Cook (2004) 70–71.

⁷⁹ On these *automata* see Barber (1992) 6–7, Labarthe-Postel (2001) 364–365, Nilsson (2001) 101–102, see also Brett (1954), Dolezal-Mavroudi (2002) 121–132.

⁸⁰ In Greek culture, eagles were often represented as catching and devouring hares; see e.g. Richter (1930) figs. 187, 188 (two late-5th-century coins of Acragas). Xenophon underscores the danger eagles present to hares in his essay *On Hunting* (5.16): "it is not just dogs they [hares] are afraid of, but eagles as well, since young ones, up to a year old, tend to get snatched up by eagles as they are crossing hillsides and bare stretches of ground" (trans. by Waterfield (1997) 139); see also 5.24 (how hares avoid the habitats of eagles). Cf. Labarthe-Postel's discussion of the eagle as symbol of Zeus, the Roman Empire, and the Byzantine Empire (Labarthe-Postel (2001) 365).

⁸¹ On how Roman sarcophagi "with pictures of the pastoral paradise ..., whether pagan or early Christian, often present a goatherd ... milking goats", see Toynbee (1973) 165.

⁸² A search of the entire corpus of "Thesaurus linguae Graecae, vers. E" for the fragment αἰπολ- (goatherd) mentioned within 99 lines of the fragment κισσύβι- (rustic cup) turned up only the one passage: Theocr. 1.27. On how Theocritus uses the

An evocation of Theocritus' *Id.* 1 would account for certain curious details of Macrembolites' milking scene. First, in Macrembolites' description, the cup placed beneath the goat's breast is called a "shepherd's cup" (ποιμενικὸν κισσύβιον), although a "goatherd" (αἰπόλος) is using the cup and there is not a shepherd in sight (1.5). Yet such a description could be evocative of what happens in *Id.* 1, for the goatherd gives the shepherd his cup (l. 149), and so in the end the goatherd's cup becomes in fact a ποιμενικὸν κισσύβιον, "shepherd's cup". This linkage seems strengthened by Macrembolites' echo of *Id.* 1's description of its κισσύβιον, "cup", as an αἰπολικὸν θάημα, "a wondrous sight for goatherds" (l. 56).⁸³ Second, in Macrembolites 1.5.4, the goatherd is occupied in milking the goat, oblivious to the fact that his milk is pouring from the leaky cup. One of the decorations on *Id.* 1's famous decorated κισσύβιον, "rustic cup", shows a boy similarly intent upon his labors (plaiting a cricket-cage) and oblivious to his losses (the foxes attacking the vines he is meant to be guarding) (ll. 46–54). There is also a correspondence between the aesthetic evaluations of the works of art in both texts: *Id.* 1's goatherd sums up the κισσύβιον as an αἰπολικὸν θάημα τέρας κέ τυ θυμὸν ἀτύξαι, "a wondrous sight for goatherds; a marvel that will amaze your heart" (l. 56); and Macrembolites' hero sums up the fountain and its sculptures thus: καὶ ἦν θέαμα καινὸν καὶ ὅλον χάριτος, "it was an extraordinary sight, full of grace" (1.5.8).

Why might Macrembolites wish to evoke the Theocritean bucolic world at the start of his romance novel? The world of a goatherd and his goat is far from the fictive world of Macrembolites' novel—its luxury homes and gardens, lavish meals, and extended flirtations. Indeed, Macrembolites underscores the distance of his statuary (and his novel) from the Theocritean bucolic world. *Id.* 1's marvelous, decorated cup has been reduced to just a leaky cup in a comic scene. There is no gift exchange, no song contest here. Thus Macrembolites' statu-

relatively rare word κισσύβιον to help signal his innovation and relation to past literary traditions, see Halperin (1983a) 167–176 (cf. Hom. *Od.* 9.346, 14.78, 16.52).

⁸³ The unusual construction at *Id.* 1.56—αἰπολικὸν rather than an "adjective of quality" with θέαμα—might have made such an expression memorable (see Gow (1952) vol. 2, 13 on l. 56; for the variant αἰολικὸν see Σ Theocr. 1.56 (pp. 51–52 Wendel), and Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1906) 36–38). Cf. the use of the adjective ποιμενικός with θώκος, "a shepherd's seat", at Theocr. 1.22–23. Compare Homer's Cyclops, who herds both goats and sheep, drinks from a κισσύβιον (*Od.* 9.346), and is occupied with milking (e.g. *Od.* 9.244–249, 341–342).

ary could suggest the fading away of vitality (of living, creative force) from Theocritean bucolic—all that is left is a goatherd milking a goat, with a leaky cup beneath her breast, and the milk running out.⁸⁴ Theocritean bucolic is now reduced to an ornament for a private luxury garden. In Eugenianus, allusions to past bucolic literature were integral to the plot, seemed suggestive of self-conscious readership on the parts of the characters, with the bucolic/pastoral past living in their memories and activities, living in the artistry of the novel. In Macrembolites, the goatherd statuary in the garden—ornamental rather than essential, with a focus on ruins (a cup that leaks)—seems instead to underscore the distance of the Byzantine novel from the bucolic/pastoral past.

Further, insofar as the statues, as automatus wonders, contribute to the overall luxury of the garden, statuary of a rustic goatherd milking a goat would put into high relief the urban luxury represented by the presence of such sculptures in a garden (again, a Hellenistic move). Just so, Macrembolites may suggest, acquaintance with ancient (bucolic) literature and art can add an elite social cachet in the Comnenian court—to be acquainted with Theocritus is like having automatus toys in a garden.

Books 2 and 4 are filled with descriptions of garden paintings.⁸⁵ Along with the statuary, the paintings bring bucolic and rural themes into the luxury garden (and the novel). In Book 4, the hero and his companion view a series of twelve painted scenes that illustrate, as they finally conjecture, divisions of the year. These scenes feature herdsmen, agricultural workers, as well as men of leisure in gardens and meadows.

The first rustic scene (4.6), a herdsman with goat (presumably an illustration of the month April),⁸⁶ corresponds to the goatherd statuary

⁸⁴ In *Id.* 1.52–54, the boy is focused on the process of creating a cage to house crickets, themselves representative of bucolic song. In Macrembolites, it is not for art that the goatherd is oblivious—he is not even piping (as later a herdsman in one of Macrembolites' garden-wall paintings will do (4.6.3)).

⁸⁵ The bucolic and rural paintings are confined to Book 4. In Book 2, the hero and his companion view painted images of four beautiful girls, identified by an inscription as Wisdom, Strength, Chastity, and Justice (2.6). Then comes a representation of Eros as an enthroned, beautiful, nude boy (2.7), with a multitude of creatures—including entire cities, kings, birds, fish, beasts—in his service (2.9). For a linkage to Plato, *Symp.* 196d (Agathon's praise of Eros for his virtues), see Alexiou (2002) 124–125.

⁸⁶ Macrembolites' hero interprets time generically (e.g., the herdsman helping a goat give birth symbolizes winter's end, 4.18.3). For identification of Macrembolites' months, see Strzygowski (1888) 26–33, Levi (1941) 285 n. 80, Åkerström-Hougen (1974) 135–136.

described earlier. April often is represented by a shepherd carrying a lamb or kid.⁸⁷ In a Christian world, such a symbol might evoke the Good Shepherd as well, as Plepelits suggests.⁸⁸ But that is not the figure we have here. In Macrembolites, the scene illustrating April shows a large, unkempt shepherd helping a goat give birth to twins, and then afterwards playing a syrinx and seeming to sing in praise of the birth and entreat Pan that his goats have many more happy births. The realism of these details, like those of the goatherd statuary earlier, seems evocative of the rustic, bucolic world of Theocritus. The twin-bearing goat in connection with a herdsman may also be specifically evocative of Theocritus' *Id.* 1, especially following on, as it does, the goatherd with the cup. *Id.* 1's goatherd offers the shepherd (ποιμήν, e.g. l. 7) Thyrsis an αἶγα ... διδυματόκον, "twin-bearing goat", to milk (l. 25);⁸⁹ in Macrembolites 4.6 a shepherd (ποιμήν, 4.6.1) helps a διδυματόκος αἶξ, "a twin-bearing goat", give birth.⁹⁰ Also, like a Theocritean herdsman, the herdsman in Macrembolites' scene too seems to pipe a prelude before singing (4.6.3; cf. *Id.* 6.20).

The giant (γίγας, Macrembolites 4.6.3), shaggy and unkempt (4.6.1, 2), bearded (4.6.1), pipe-playing (4.6.3), singing (4.6.3) shepherd in Macrembolites' scene might also recall another of Theocritus' herdsmen: the giant, shaggy (λάσιος, *Id.* 11.31, 50; Macrembolites 4.6.2), bearded (*Id.* 6.36; cf. *Id.* 11.9), pipe-playing (*Id.* 6.9), singing (*Id.* 11.13, 18) Cyclops. In addition, the focus on milking in Macrembolites' goatherd statuary (1.5.3–4) may evoke *Id.* 11's Cyclops' preoccupation with milking (ll. 35, 65, 75); as for occupation, in *Id.* 6 Galateia is said to call the Cyclops (mockingly) a goatherd (l. 7). Certainly if Macrembolites followed Eugenianus chronologically, as traditionally thought, after Eugenianus' striking and explicit recurring references to Theocritus' Cyclops,⁹¹ the Cyclops figure would easily come to mind in his novel.

⁸⁷ Levi (1941) 260.

⁸⁸ Plepelits (1989) 48–49; for a detailed reading of the novel as Christian allegory—including Hysmine "als Hypostase Christi"—see 29–61 (cf. Beaton (1996) 213–214; Alexiou (2002) esp. 112, 124).

⁸⁹ Cf. related themes at Longus 2.33.3–34.1: bucolic gift-exchange; a Theocritus figure (Hunter (1983) 59); Pan's promise to Syrinx that her goats will bear twins.

⁹⁰ Twin-bearing goats are not common in extant Greek literature: a search of Thesaurus Linguae Graecae E turned up eight examples in combination with herdsmen (Theocr. 1.25, 3.34, 5.84, [8.45]; Longus 2.34.1; Greg. Nyss. *In sanctum Pascha* 254.17; Callim. *Hymn* 2.54; Phil.Thess. *AP* 6.99.5 = *GPh* 2731), and another ten apart from herdsmen (mostly in scientific discussions).

⁹¹ For discussion see Burton (2003) 253–262.

But whether Macrembolites preceded or followed Eugenianus, recurrent echoes of Theocritus' famous Cyclops among the Byzantine novels would not be surprising. An evocation of Theocritus' self-deluded Cyclops, in fact, would also strengthen the sense of distance between the urbane world of Macrembolites' luxury gardens and the unkempt, rustic, mythical world of a Theocritean past.

Why the strong emphasis on the birthing of goats in Macrembolites' scene? Indeed, if this image is meant to represent April as a month of fertility, a shepherd carrying a lamb or kid usually suffices for that. Yet Macrembolites' herdsman is emphatically described as delivering baby-goats. As in the case of any *ekphrasis*, there may be a metaliterary dimension (beyond the increased fertility and prosperity represented by twin goats): through the eyes of fictive characters responding to works of art, an author might reflect on the nature of fiction, of art, and of audience reception. Thus, insofar as an *ekphrasis* of a work of art can raise issues of audience and artistic production, the focus here on the birthing process in the context of a 12th-cent. rebirth of the genre of the novel seems evocative. A recollection of Theocritus, traditionally credited with being the father of bucolic poetry, would strengthen this metapoetic moment. Yet Macrembolites' novel also reduces Theocritus' bucolic project to miniaturized moments of shepherdly performance within works of art in a garden. Unlike Eugenianus, in whose novel bucolic/pastoral imagery and themes are pervasive, Macrembolites isolates the bucolic (within garden walls), as if to differentiate his novel from a more 'pastoral' variety (such as Eugenianus'). There is a correspondence to Theocritus' Cyclops poems at another level as well—the Hellenistic aesthetic of a beautiful work of art about someone/thing ugly.⁹²

An *ekphrasis* provides opportunities for allegory, which was popular among the Byzantines (as earlier). Among the Byzantines allegory could be used to make even erotic literature acceptable to a Christian readership (see, for example, the allegorizing of the *Song of Songs*).⁹³ Although in such an intensely Christian environment, one can hardly dismiss the

⁹² On this aesthetic see e.g. Fowler (1989) 66–78, Smith (1991) 136–140, Burton (1995) 99–102, Zanker (2004) 130–136.

⁹³ On Eugenianus' use of the *Song of Songs*, cf. Burton (1998) 201–203. See also Dawson (1992) 10: "if the literal sense is culturally shocking ..., an allegorical reading might well serve to domesticate the text—to show that its literal meaning really is in step with cultural expectation".

impulse on the part of some viewers to allegorize, the most distinctive (novel) elements of Macrembolites' painted scenes do not suggest Christian allegory: for example, we have already seen that Macrembolites' April does not show a shepherd carrying a lamb over his shoulders.⁹⁴ Further, the elements of the paintings emphasized by the hero and his companion in their interpretations are not overtly Christian.⁹⁵ Rather than focus on generic, familiar aspects of the images of the months, the author directs attention to the originality of his images by having the hero emphasize (in his retelling) how he and his companion were "astounded by the extraordinary depictions" (τοῖς παραδόξοις ἐξεπληττόμεθα, 4.17.1).⁹⁶

4. Epilogue

Macrembolites' place in the chronological order of the novels is a matter of dispute. The traditional order puts Macrembolites last (after Prodrômus and Eugenianus); Macrembolites has also been placed first. Yet whatever the order, there is intense dialogue between the three novels. In contrast to Eugenianus—who featured bucolic/pastoral themes and

⁹⁴ Were Macrembolites' primary aim in this case religious allegory, he might have depicted a shepherd (usually young and beardless) carrying a lamb or kid on his shoulders (the Good-Shepherd type); on such a representation for April in the mosaic of the Hammām of Beisan, and the linkage with the Good Shepherd, see Levi (1941) 260; for other images of (young) shepherds carrying lambs or kids to illustrate April, see Åkerström-Hougen (1974) 121, 122, 123, 125, 134, 135 (with accompanying figs.). Macrembolites innovates by representing April as a giant, unkempt, bearded man delivering baby goats—holding one while birthing the other.

⁹⁵ Other paintings in the garden include a rich man in a flowery meadow and various agricultural workers, as appropriate to the months. These illustrations offer a wide spectrum of rural/pastoral imagery to be exploited in the course of the novel: the vintage, the flowery meadow, the agricultural world all offer familiar imagery of love. On the linkage between the hero's initiation into erotic love and the process of allegorically interpreting the paintings, see Beaton (1996) 84–85; Burton (forthcoming). On Hellenistic interest in the subjective factor in *ekphrasis*, see Goldhill (1994), Burton (1995) 93–114, Skinner (2001); see also Elsner (2000).

⁹⁶ Repeatedly Macrembolites has his hero, Hysminias, disclose qualities he admires in art (and in which the author may take pride as well); evaluative words include καινός, "novel, innovative" (2.7.5, the painter's hand; 1.5.8, the fountain and sculptures), τέρας, "marvel" (2.10.4, the painting of Eros), τερατοργέω, "work wonders" (2.7.5, the act of creating). Cf. Achilles Tatius' use of the expression θέαμα καινόν for novel sights (2.14.4, 4.4.7, 4.12.1). On Byzantine use of terms related to expressions of aesthetic approval, see Kazhdan (1984) 186 (Eustathius of Thessalonica) and Agapitos (1998) 135 (Psellos); cf. Mullett (1995) 40.

imagery throughout, who suggested the possibility of reviving bucolic literature (and showed a way to do so)—Macrembolites relegates the bucolic mostly to works of ornamental art in an enclosed, luxury garden (available for viewing, but contained, kept behind walls). In the Byzantine novel's world of reciprocal passion resulting in (Christian) marriage,⁹⁷ the rustic Theocritean world (of happy animal promiscuity contrasting with frustrated, unreciprocated human love) is now relegated to works of ornamental art in a luxury garden. Macrembolites' goatherd's leaky cup, recalling the cup in Theocritus' *Id.* 1, may also evoke Prodromus' elaborate, decorated cup. Yet unlike the goatherd's finely crafted, decorated cup of Theocritus, Macrembolites' cup leaks. Thus if Macrembolites follows Eugenianus, as traditionally supposed, such statuary at the start of his novel would programmatically set his novel apart from Eugenianus'. If Eugenianus follows Macrembolites, on the other hand, as sometimes suggested, Eugenianus could be seen as self-assertively reviving the bucolic world that Macrembolites preserved (and contained) in works of garden art. Prodromus treats classical bucolic/pastoral as dangerous: he breaks the cup decorated with scenes of a rural vintage and Dionysiac dancing. Yet, as opposed to Prodromus, who presents the audience with a splendid cup that is destroyed, Macrembolites suggests that Theocritean bucolic can continue to function within a novel as pretty works of (rustic) art in a walled garden, as emblems to be interpreted anew but able to be kept contained.

In filling a garden with luxury works of art (described and interpreted at great length), Macrembolites shows his originality (a quality appreciated also by his fictive characters). Yet he also suggests the anachronism of Theocritean bucolic by encasing it in works of art in a private luxury garden. Macrembolites seems to have been more in tune with Byzantine readership than Eugenianus. There is not much evidence for the writing of classical bucolic/pastoral among the Byzantines, and elitist, scholarly novels soon cease to be written. The next significant development of the Greek novel is the emergence, in the next century, of Byzantine romances, written not in classicizing Attic but in vernacular Greek. Although these romances are full of descriptions of gardens and meadows, the 12th-cent. novels' intensely learned intertextual experiment with classical bucolic/pastoral was at an end.

⁹⁷ See Burton (2000) 405–408.

Indeed, these 12th-cent. novels can be seen as marking a turn away from detailed, scholarly engagement with classical, Theocritean bucolic toward the long-standing tradition of erotic garden and meadow imagery—a rich legacy for later transformations of pastoral.⁹⁸

⁹⁸ I am grateful to the editors as well as Erwin Cook and Thomas Jenkins for their valuable comments on this essay.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Title abbreviations for journals are those used in *L'Année philologique*; otherwise titles are given in full.

- Abbenes, J.G.J. 1996. "The Doric of Theocritus, a Literary Language", in Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (eds.), 1–19.
- Acosta-Hughes, B. 2002. *Polyeideia: The Iambi of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- Acosta-Hughes, B., Kosmetatou, E., and Baumbach, M. (eds.) 2004. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)*, Cambridge MA.
- Adams, J.N. 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge.
- Adams, J.N., Janse, M., and Swain, S. (eds.) 2002. *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Word*, Oxford.
- Agapitos, P.A. 1998. "Narrative, Rhetoric, and 'Drama' Rediscovered: Scholars and Poets in Byzantium Interpret Heliodorus", in R. Hunter (ed.), *Studies in Heliodorus*, Cambridge, 125–156.
- Agapitos, P.A. 2000. "Poets and Painters: Theodoros Prodromos' Dedicatory Verses of His Novel to an Anonymous Caesar", *JÖByz* 50, 173–185.
- Åkerström-Hougen, G. 1974. *The Calendar and Hunting Mosaics of the Villa of the Falconer in Argos: A Study in Early Byzantine Iconography*, Stockholm.
- Albert, W. 1988. *Das mimetische Gedicht in der Antike*, Frankfurt/Main.
- Albrecht, M. von 1997. *A History of Roman Literature*, (Engl. trans.; Bern and Munich 1992) Leiden.
- Alesse, F. 1998. "La Repubblica di Zenone di Cizio e la letteratura socratica", *SIFC* 16, 17–38.
- Alexiou, M. 1974. *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*, Cambridge.
- Alexiou, M. 1977. "A Critical Reappraisal of Eustathios Makrembolites' *Hysmine and Hysminias*", *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 3, 23–43.
- Alexiou, M. 2002. *After Antiquity: Greek Language, Myth, and Metaphor*, Ithaca NY and London.
- Allen, D.C. 1956. "Three Poems on Eros", *Comparative Literature* 8, 177–190.
- Allen, S.H. 1990. "Dionysiac Imagery in Coptic Textiles and Later Medieval Art", in A.S. Bernardo and S. Levin (eds.), *The Classics in the Middle Ages (Papers of the 20th Annual Conference of the Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies)*, Binghamton NY, 11–24.
- Allen, T.W. 1895. "Descriptive Names of Animals in Greece", *CR* 9, 12–13.
- Allen, T.W., Halliday, W.R., and Sikes, E.E. (eds.) 1936. *The Homeric Hymns*, Oxford.
- Alpers, P. 1979. *The Singer of the Eclogues: A Study of Virgilian Pastoral*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.

- Alpers, P. 1983. "Convening and Convention in Pastoral Poetry", *New Literary History* 14, 277–304.
- Alpers, P. 1990. "Theocritean Bucolic and Virgilian Pastoral", *Arethusa* 23, 19–47.
- Alpers, P. 1996. *What is Pastoral?*, Chicago and London.
- Amat, J. 1991. *Calpurnius Siculus, Bucoliques. Pseudo-Calpurnius, Éloge de Pison*, Paris.
- Anderson, W.S. 1986. "The Theory and Practice of Poetic Arrangement from Vergil to Ovid", in Fraistat (ed.), 44–65.
- Andrews, N.E. 1996. "Narrative and Allusion in Theocritus, Idyll 2", in Har-der, Regtuit, and Wakker (eds.), 21–53.
- Anello, P. 1984. "Polifemo e Galatea", *Seia* 1, 11–51.
- Angold, M. 1997. *The Byzantine Empire, 1025–1204: A Political History*, (2nd ed.) London.
- Argentieri, L., 2003. *Gli epigrammi degli Antipatri*, Bari.
- Arland, W. 1937. *Nachtheokritische Bukolik bis an die Schwelle der lateinischen Bukolik*, Diss. Leipzig.
- Armstrong, D. 1986. "Stylistics and the Date of Calpurnius Siculus", *Philologus* 130, 113–136.
- Arnott, W.G. 1996. *Alexis. The Fragments*. Cambridge.
- Asper, M. 1997. *Onomata allotria: Zur Genese, Struktur und Funktion poetologischen Metaphern bei Kallimachos*, Stuttgart.
- Athanassakis, A. 1992. "Cattle and Honour in Homer and Hesiod", *Ramus* 21, 156–186.
- Audollent, A. 1939. "Double inscription prophylactique contre la grêle", *MAI* 43, 45–75.
- Austin, C. and Bastianini, G. 2002. *Posidippi Pellaei quae supersunt omnia*, Milan.
- Aygon, J.-P. 2004. *Pictor in fabula. L'ecphrasis-descriptio dans les tragédies de Sénèque*, Brussels.
- Balavoine, C. 1985. "Vie et mort de l'allégorie dans les commentaires des *Bucoliques* virgiliennes à la Renaissance", in M. Renard and P. Laurens (eds.), *Hommages à Henry Bardon*, Brussels, 10–40.
- Baldwin, B. 1976. "Vergilius Graecus", *AJPh* 97, 361–368.
- Baldwin, B. 1985. *An Anthology of Byzantine Poetry*, Amsterdam.
- Balensiefen, L. 2005. 'Polyphem-Grotten und Skylla-Gewässer: Schauplätze der Odyssee in römischen Villen', in A. Luther, *Odysseerezeptionen*, Frankfurt/Main, 18–31.
- Barbantani, S. 2002. Φάτις Νικηφόρος. *Frammenti di elegia encomiastica nell'età delle guerre galatiche: Supplementum Hellenisticum 958 e 969*, Milan.
- Barber, C. 1992. "Reading the Garden in Byzantium: Nature and Sexuality", *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 16, 1–19.
- Barchiesi, M. 1967. "Arte del prologo e arte della transizione", *Studi danteschi* 44, 115–207 (= Id., *Il testo e il tempo*, Urbino 1987, 11–111).
- Barchiesi, A. 1996. "Poetry, Praise, and Patronage: Simonides in Book 4 of Horace's *Odes*", *ClAnt* 15, 5–47.
- Barchiesi, A. 1997a. *The Poet and the Prince. Ovid and Augustan Discourse*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- Barchiesi, A. 1997b. Review of Sharrock (1994), in *Gnomon* 69, 672–675.

- Barchiesi, A. 2000. "Rituals in Ink: Horace on the Greek Lyric Tradition", in Depew and Obbink (eds.), 167–182.
- Barchiesi, A. 2001a. *Speaking Volumes: Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and other Latin Poets*, London.
- Barchiesi, A. 2001b. "The Crossing", in S. Harrison (ed.), *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics*, Oxford, 142–163.
- Barchiesi, A. 2005a. *Ovidio, Metamorfosi*. vol. 1: *Libri I–II*, Milan.
- Barchiesi, A. 2005b. "The Search for the Perfect Book: A P.S. to the New Posidippus", in Gutzwiller (ed.), 320–342.
- Barigazzi, A. 1974. "Per l'interpretazione e la datazione del carme IV di Teocrito", *RFIC* 102, 301–311.
- Barigazzi, A. 1976. "Eracle e Tiodamante in Callimaco e Apollonio Rodio", *Prometheus* 2, 227–238.
- Barker, A. 1984. *Greek Musical Writings*, vol. 1, Cambridge.
- Barrell, J. and Bull, J. (eds.) 1974. *The Penguin Book of English Pastoral Verse*, London.
- Bayer, K. 2002. *Suetons Vergilvita. Versuch einer Rekonstruktion*, Tübingen (identical with the author's doctoral dissertation, Munich 1952).
- Beaton, R. 1996. *The Medieval Greek Romance*, (2nd ed.) London.
- Becker, P. 1913. "Vergil und Quintus", *RhM* 68, 68–90.
- Beckwith, J. 1962. *The Veroli Casket*, London.
- Benveniste, E. 1973. *Indo-European Language and Society*, (Engl. trans.; Paris 1969) Coral Gables FL.
- Berg, W. 1965. "Daphnis and Prometheus", *TAPhA* 96, 11–23.
- Berg, W. 1974. *Early Virgil*, London.
- Berger, H. 1984. "The Origins of Bucolic Representation: Disenchantment and Revision in Theocritus' Seventh *Idyll*", *CLAnt* 3, 1–39.
- Bernsdorff, H. 1994. "Polyphem und Daphnis: zu Theokrits sechstem *Idyll*", *Philologus* 138, 38–51.
- Bernsdorff, H. 1996. "Parataktische Gleichnisse bei Theokrit", in Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (eds.), 71–90.
- Bernsdorff, H. 1999. *Das Fragmentum bucolicum Vindobonense*, Göttingen.
- Bernsdorff, H. 2001. *Hirten in der nicht-bukolischen Dichtung des Hellenismus*, Stuttgart.
- Bernsdorff, H. 2005. "Taucher aus Liebe (zu Poseidipp 19, 7–8 A.-B. und Moschos fr. 3 G.)", *ΣPE* 150, 36–38.
- Bing, P. 1998. "La culture littéraire d'Alexandrie au III^e siècle avant J.-C.", in *La gloire d'Alexandrie (7 mai – 26 juillet 1998: une exposition des musées de la Ville de Paris)*, Paris, 133–135.
- Bing, P. 2003. "The Unruly Tongue: Philitas of Cos as Scholar and Poet", *CPh* 98, 330–348.
- Bissing, F.W. von 1953. "I culti dei Dioscuri in Egitto", *Aegyptus* 33, 347–357.
- Borca, F. 2000. "Per loca senta situ ire: an exploration of the chthonian landscape", *CB* 76.1, 51–59.
- Borgeaud, P. 1988. *The Cult of Pan in Ancient Greece*, (Engl. trans.; Rome 1979) Chicago.
- Bowersock, G.W. 1971. "A Date in the *Eighth Eclogue*", *HSPH* 75, 73–80.

- Bowersock, G.W. 1978. "The Addressee of the Eighth Eclogue: a Response", *HSPh* 82, 201–202.
- Bowersock, G.W. 1990. *Hellenism in Late Antiquity*, Ann Arbor.
- Bowie, E.L. 1985. "Theocritus' Seventh *Idyll*, Philetas and Longus", *CQ* 35, 67–91.
- Bowie, E.L. 1994. "The Readership of Greek Novels in the Ancient World", in Tatum (ed.), 435–459.
- Bowie, E.L. 1996. "Frame and Framed in Theocritus Poems 6 and 7", in Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (eds.), 91–100.
- Boyle, A.J. (ed.) 1975. *Ancient Pastoral: Ramus Essays on Greek and Roman Pastoral Poetry*, (= *Ramus* 4.2) Berwick.
- Boyle, A.J. 1986. *The Chaonian Dove: Essays on the Eclogues, Georgics, and Aeneid of Virgil*, Leiden.
- Brashear, W. 1979. "Ein Berliner Zauberpapyrus", *ŽPE* 33, 261–278.
- Breed, B.W. 2000. "Imitations of Originality: Theocritus and Lucretius at the Start of the *Eclogues*", *Vergilius* 46, 3–20.
- Brett, G. 1954. "The Automata in the Byzantine 'Throne of Solomon'", *Speculum* 3, 477–487.
- Brink, C.O. 1971. *Horace on Poetry. The Ars Poetica*, Cambridge.
- Brink, C.O. 1982. *Horace on Poetry. Epistles book II: The Letters to Augustus and Florus*, Cambridge.
- Brown, E.L. 1963. *Numeri Vergiliani: Studies in Eclogues and Georgics*, Brussels.
- Brown, E.L. 1981. "The Lycidas of Theocritus' *Idyll* 7", *HSPh* 85, 59–100.
- Browning, R. 1960. "Recentiores non deteriores", *BICS* 7 (1960), 11–21 (= D. Harlfinger (ed.), *Griechische Kodikologie und Textüberlieferung*, Darmstadt 1980, 259–275).
- Browning, R. 1995. "Tradition and Originality in Literary Criticism and Scholarship", in Littlewood (ed.), 17–28.
- Brugnoli, G. 1988. "Servio", in *Enciclopedia virgiliana*, vol. 4, 805–813.
- Brugnoli, G. and Stok, F. 1997. *Vitae Vergilianae antiquae*, Rome.
- Brunt, P.A. 1971. *Italian Manpower*, Oxford.
- Bücheler, F. 1875. "De bucolicorum Graecorum aliquot carminibus", *RhM* 30, 33–61.
- Buchheit, V. 1984. "Lukrez über den Ursprung von Musik und Dichtung", *RhM* 127, 141–158.
- Buchheit, V. 1986. "Frühling in den Eklogen: Vergil und Lukrez", *RhM* 129, 123–141.
- Bühler, W. 1960. *Die Europa des Moschos*, Wiesbaden.
- Burkert, W. 1985. *Greek Religion*, (Engl. trans.; Stuttgart 1977) Cambridge MA.
- Burnyeat, M.F. 1997. "Postscript on Silent Reading", *CQ* 47, 74–76.
- Burton, J.B. 1995. *Theocritus' Urban Mimes: Mobility, Gender, and Patronage*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- Burton, J.B. 1998. "Reviving the Pagan Greek Novel in a Christian World", *GRBS* 39, 179–216.
- Burton, J.B. 2000. "Abduction and Elopement in the Byzantine Novel", *GRBS* 41, 377–409.

- Burton, J.B. 2003. "A Reemergence of Theocritean Poetry in the Byzantine Novel", *CPh* 98, 251–273.
- Burton, J.B. 2004. *A Byzantine Novel: Drosilla and Charicles by Niketas Eugenianos*, Wauconda IL.
- Burton, J.B. forthcoming. "Byzantine Readers of the Novel", in T. Whitmarsh (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel*, Cambridge.
- Butler, H.E. 1909. *Post-Augustan Poetry*, Oxford.
- Buxton, R. 1994. *Imaginary Greece: The Contexts of Mythology*, Cambridge.
- Cadili, L. 2001. *Viamque adfectat Olympo: memoria ellenistica nelle Georgiche di Virgilio*, Milan.
- Cairns, F. 1999. "Virgil *Eclogue* 1.1–2: A Literary Programme?", *HSPH* 99, 289–293.
- Cameron, Alan. 1965. "Wandering Poets: A Literary Movement in Byzantine Egypt", *Historia* 14, 470–509.
- Cameron, Alan. 1970. *Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius*, Oxford.
- Cameron, Averil. 1970. *Agathias*, Oxford.
- Cameron, Alan. 1982. "The Empress and the Poet: Paganism and Politics at the Court of Theodosius II", *YCS* 27, 217–289.
- Cameron, Alan. 1995. *Callimachus and His Critics*, Princeton.
- Cameron, Alan. 2004. *Greek Mythography in the Roman World*, Oxford-New York.
- Carpenter, T.H. 1986. *Dionysian Imagery in Archaic Greek Art: Its Development in Black-Figure Vase Painting*, Oxford.
- Carpenter, T.H. 1991. *Art and Myth in Ancient Greece: A Handbook*, London.
- Carpenter, T.H. 1997. *Dionysian Imagery in Fifth-Century Athens*, Oxford.
- Casadio, V. 1986/87. "Catull. III 1ss.", *MCr* 21–22, 337–338.
- Castagna, L. 1970. "Le fonti greche dei *Bucolica* di Nemesiano", *Aevum* 44, 415–443.
- Castelli, G. 1966. "Echi lucreziani nelle *Ecloghe* virgiliane", *RSC* 14, 313–342.
- Castelli, G. 1967. "Echi lucreziani nelle *Ecloghe* virgiliane", *RSC* 15, 14–39, 176–216.
- Castiglioni, L. 1926. "Tryphiodorea: Trifiodoro e Virgilio", *RFIC* 4, 501–517.
- Cataudella, Q. (ed.) 1958. *Il romanzo classico*, Florence 1958.
- Cataudella, Q. 1927. "Riflessi virgiliani nel romanzo di Caritone", *Athenaeum* 5, 302–312.
- Cavarzere, A. 1996. *Sul limitare: il "motto" e la poesia di Orazio*, Bologna.
- Chalk, H.H.O. 1960. "Eros and the Lesbian Pastorals of Longos", *JHS* 80, 32–51 (= Gärtner (ed.) (1984), 388–407; = Effe (ed.) (1986), 402–439).
- Chamberlayne, L.P. 1916. "A Study in Nonnus", *Studies in Philology* 13, 40–68.
- Champlin, E. 1978. "The Life and Times of Calpurnius Siculus", *JRS* 68, 95–110.
- Champlin, E. 1986. "History and the Date of Calpurnius Siculus", *Philologus* 130, 104–112.
- Cholmeley, R. 1901. *The Idylls of Theocritus*, London.
- Chrétien, G. 1985. *Nonnos de Panopolis. Les Dionysiaques. Tome IV. Chants IX–X*, Paris.

- Christie, F.C. 1973. "Longus and the Development of the Pastoral Tradition" (Diss. summary), *HSPh* 77, 246–247.
- Chuvin, P. 1976. *Nonnos de Panopolis. Les Dionysiaques. Tome II. Chants III–IV*, Paris.
- Cichorius, C. 1922. *Römische Studien: Historisches Epigraphisches Literaturgeschichtliches aus vier Jahrhunderten Roms*, Leipzig and Berlin.
- Clausen, W. 1964. "Callimachus and Latin Poetry", *GRBS* 5, 182–196.
- Clausen, W. 1976. "Cynthius", *AJPh* 97, 245–247 (with an addendum *ibid.* 98, 1977, 362) (= Hardie (ed.) (1999), vol. 1, 385–387).
- Clausen, W. 1994. *A Commentary on Virgil. Eclogues*, Oxford.
- Clay, J.S. 2003. *Hesiod's Cosmos*, Cambridge.
- Coleman, R. 1977. *Virgil. Eclogues*, Cambridge.
- Collins, C. 1996. *Authority Figures: Metaphors of Mastery from the Iliad to the Apocalypse*, Lanham MD.
- Collins, D. 2001. "Theoris of Lemnos and the Criminalization of Magic in Fourth-Century Athens", *CQ* 51, 477–493.
- Collins, D. 2004. *Master of the Game: Competition and Performance in Greek Poetry*, Washington DC.
- Comotti, G. 1989. *Music in Greek and Roman Culture*, (Engl. trans.; Turin 1979) Baltimore and London.
- Conca, F. 1990. *Nicetas Eugenianus. De Drosillae et Chariclis amoribus*, Amsterdam.
- Conington, J. and Nettleship, H. 1898. *The Works of Virgil, with a Commentary*, vol. 1: *Eclogues and Georgics*, (5th ed., rev. F. Haverfield) London.
- Connolly, J. 2001. "Picture Arcadia: The Politics of Representation in Vergil's *Eclogues*", *Vergilius* 47, 89–116.
- Connors, C. 2005. "Metaphor and Politics in John Barclay's *Argenis*", in Harrison, Paschalis, and Frangoulidis (eds.), 245–274.
- Conte, G.B. 1984. *Virgilio: il genere e i suoi confini*, Milan (2nd ed.).
- Conte, G.B. 1994. *Genres and Readers: Lucretius, Love Elegy, Pliny's Encyclopedia*, Baltimore and London.
- Cook, E. 2004. "Near Eastern Sources for the Palace of Alkinoos", *AJPh* 108, 43–77.
- Copley, F.O. 1940. "The Suicide-Paracausithyron: A Study of Ps.-Theocritus Idyll XXIII", *TAPhA* 71, 52–61.
- Copley, F.O. 1956. *Exclusus Amator: A Study in Latin Love Poetry*, Baltimore.
- Correa, J.A. 1977. "Los pastores de Calpurnio Sículo", *Habis* 8, 149–159.
- Courtney, E. 1987. "Imitation, chronologie littéraire et Calpurnius Siculus", *REL* 65, 148–157.
- Cozzoli, A.-T. 1994. "Dalla catarsi mimetica aristotelica all'autocatarsi dei poeti ellenistici", *QUCC* 48, 95–110.
- Cozzoli, A.-T. 2000. "Dalla poesia al romanzo: motivi poetici nella rielaborazione narrativa di Longo Sofista", *SemRom* 3, 295–312.
- Crane, G. 1987. "The Laughter of Aphrodite in Theocritus, Idyll 1", *HSPh* 91, 161–184.
- Cremonesi, E. 1958. "Rapporti tra le origini della poesia bucolica e della poesia comica nella tradizione peripatetica", *Dioniso* 21, 109–121.

- Cresci, L.R. 1981. "Il romanzo di Longo Sofista e la tradizione bucolica", *A&R* 26, 1–25 (Engl. trans. in Swain (ed.) (1999), 210–242).
- Croisille, J.-M. 1982. *Poésie et art figuré de Néron aux Flaviens: Recherches sur l'iconographie et la correspondance des arts à l'époque impériale*, Brussels.
- Csapo, E. 2004. "The Politics of the New Music", in P. Murray and P. Wilson (eds.), *Music and the Muses: The Culture of "Mousike" in the Classical Athenian City*, Oxford, 207–248.
- Culler, J. 1983. *On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism after Structuralism*, London.
- Cunningham, I.C. 1971. *Herodas. Mimambi*, Oxford.
- Curtius, E.R. 1953. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, (Engl. trans.; Bern 1948) New York.
- Dain, A. 1956. "À propos de l'étude des poètes anciens à Byzance", in *Studi in onore di U.E. Paoli*, Florence, 195–201.
- Dalmeyda, G. 1934. *Longus: Pastorales (Daphnis et Chloé)*, Paris.
- Damon, P. 1973. *Modes of Analogy in Ancient and Medieval Verse*, Berkeley and Los Angeles (reprint from *Univ. of California Publ. in Class. Phil.* 15.6, 1961).
- Davies, M. 1987. "Description by Negation : History of a Thought-Pattern in Ancient Accounts of Blissful Life", *Prometheus* 13, 265–284.
- Davies, M. 1988a. "Monody, Choral Lyric, and the Tyranny of the Handbook", *CQ* 38, 52–64.
- Davies, M. 1988b. "'Ere the World Began to Be': Description by Negation in Cosmogonic Literature", *Prometheus* 14, 15–24.
- Davies, M. 1995. "Theocritus' *Adoniazusae*", *G&R* 42, 152–158.
- Davis, P.J. 1988. "Structure and Meaning in the Eclogues of Calpurnius Siculus", in A.J. Boyle (ed.), *The Imperial Muse: Ramus Essays on Roman Literature of the Empire (= Ramus 16)* Berwick, 32–54.
- Dawson, D. 1992. *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- De Saint-Denis, E. 1960. *Virgile. Bucoliques*, Paris.
- Depew, M. 1993. "Mimesis and Aetiology in Callimachus' Hymns", in Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (eds.), 57–77.
- Depew, M. and Obbink, D. (eds.) 2000. *Matrices of Genre. Authors, Canons, and Society*, Cambridge MA and London.
- Deuse, W. 1990. "Dichtung als Heilmittel gegen die Liebe. Zum 11. Idyll Theokrits", in Steinmetz (ed.), 59–76.
- Dewar, M.J. 1994. "Laying it on with a Trowel: the Proem to Lucan and Related Texts", *CQ* 44, 199–211.
- Dewar, M.J. 2003. Review of Merfeld (1999), in *Gnomon* 75, 70–72.
- Di Lorenzo, E. 1988. "Aspetti letterari e atteggiamenti espressivi nelle *Bucoliche* di Calpurnio Siculo", *Misure critiche* 18, 5–21.
- Di Marco, M. 1995. "Lessico agonistico e sconfitta in amore: lo 'strozzamento' di Molone (Theocr. *Id.* VII 125)", in L. Belloni, G. Milanese, and A. Porro (eds.), *Studia classica I. Tarditi oblata*, vol. 1, Milan, 625–638.
- Di Marco, M. 2000. "Fileta *praeceptor amoris*: Longo Sofista e la correzione del modello bucolico", *SCO* 47, 9–35.
- Di Salvo, L. 1990. *Tito Calpurnio Siculo. Ecloga VII*, Bologna.
- Dickey, E. 2002. *Latin Forms of Address from Plautus to Apuleius*, Oxford.

- Diehl, E. 1911. *Die Vitae Vergilianae und ihre antiken Quellen*, Bonn.
- Dieten, J.-L. van, 1975. *Nicetae Choniatae Historia*, Berlin and New York.
- D'Ippolito, G. 1976. *Trifiodoro*, Palermo.
- Dodds, E.R. 1951. *The Greeks and the Irrational*, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Dodds, E.R. 1960. *Euripides. Bacchae*, (2nd ed.) Oxford.
- Dolezal, M.-L. and Mavroudi, M. 2002. "Theodore Hyrtakenos' *Description of the Garden of St. Anna* and the Ekphrasis of Gardens", in A. Littlewood, H. Maguire, and J. Wolschke-Bulmahn (eds.), *Byzantine Garden Culture*, Washington DC, 105–158.
- Doorn, P. and Bommeljé, L.S. 1990. "Transhumance in Aetolia, Central Greece: A Mountain Economy Caught between Storage and Mobility", *Rivista di studi liguri* 56, 81–97.
- Dover, K.J. 1971. *Theocritus: Select Poems*, Basingstoke and London.
- Dover, K.J. 1993. *Aristophanes Frogs*, Oxford.
- Du Quesnay, I.M. Le M. 1976/77. "Virgil's Fifth *Eclogue*: The Song of Mopsus and the New Daphnis", *PVS* 16, 18–41 (= Hardie (ed.) (1999), vol. 1, 351–384).
- Du Quesnay, I.M. Le M. 1977. "Virgil's Fourth *Eclogue*", in *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 1976, 25–99 (= Hardie (ed.) (1999), vol. 1, 283–350).
- Du Quesnay, I.M. Le M. 1979. "From Polyphemus to Corydon. Virgil, *Eclogue* 2 and the Idylls of Theocritus", in D. West and T. Woodman (eds.), *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*, Cambridge, 35–69.
- Du Quesnay, I.M. Le M. 1981. "Virgil's First *Eclogue*", in *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 3, 29–182.
- Dubielzig, U. 1996. *Triphiodor. Die Einnahme Ilions*, Tübingen.
- Dubuisson, M. 1979. "Le latin des historiens grecs", *LEC* 47, 89–106.
- Dubuisson, M. 1984–1986. "Lucien et Rome", *AncSoc* 15–17, 185–207.
- Dubuisson, M. 1985. *Le latin de Polybe: Les implications historiques d' un cas de bilinguisme*, Paris.
- Duff, J.W. and Duff, A.M. 1934. *Minor Latin Poets*, London and Cambridge MA.
- Edmonds, J.M. 1916. *Daphnis and Chloe by Longus*, London and New York.
- Edquist, H. 1975. "Aspects of Theocritean otium", in Boyle (ed.), 101–114.
- Edwards, C. 1996. *Writing Rome: Textual Approaches to the City*, Cambridge.
- Effe, B. (ed.) 1986. *Theokrit und die griechische Bukolik*, Darmstadt.
- Effe, B. 1982. "Longos. Zur Funktionsgeschichte der Bukolik in der römischen Kaiserzeit", *Hermes* 110, 65–84 (Engl. trans. in Swain (ed.) (1999), 189–209).
- Effe, B. and Binder, G. 2001. *Antike Hirtendichtung. Eine Einführung*, (2nd ed.) Düsseldorf and Zurich.
- EGGER, E. 1867. *Mémoires de la littérature ancienne*, Paris.
- Elliger, W. 1975. *Die Darstellung der Landschaft in der griechischen Dichtung*, Berlin and New York.
- Elsner, J. 2000. "Between Mimesis and Divine Power: Visuality in the Greco-Roman World", in R.S. Nelson (ed.), *Visuality Before and Beyond the Renaissance: Seeing as Others Saw*, Cambridge, 45–69.
- Empson, W. 1935. *Some Versions of Pastoral*, London.

- Erbse, H. 1965. "Dichtkunst und Medizin in Theokrits 11. Idyll", *MH* 22, 232–236.
- Esposito, P. 1996. "Per la storia della ricezione di Virgilio bucolico: l'ecloga IV di Calpurnio Siculo", *Orpheus* 17, 13–34.
- Estevez, V.A. 1981. "Ἀπώλετο καλὸς Ἀδωνις: A Description of Bion's Refrain", *Maia* 33, 35–42.
- Fabre-Serris, J. 2003. "Ovide et la naissance du genre pastoral. Réflexions sur l'ars noua et la hiérarchie des genres (Mét. 2, 668–719)", *MD* 50, 185–194.
- Fairclough, H.R. and Goid, G.P. 1999. *Virgil. Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid I–VI*, Cambridge MA and London.
- Famerie, E. 1998. *Le latin et le grec d'Appien*, Geneva.
- Fantazzi, C. and Querbach, C.W. 1985. "Sound and Substance: A Reading of Virgil's Seventh Eclogue", *Phoenix* 39, 355–367.
- Fantuzzi, M. 1985. *Bionis Smyrnaei Adonidis epitaphium*, Liverpool.
- Fantuzzi, M. 1994. "On the Metre of *Anacreont.* 19 W.", *CQ* 44, 540–542.
- Fantuzzi, M. 1995a. "Mythological Paradigms in the Bucolic Poetry of Theocritus", *PCPhS* 41, 16–35.
- Fantuzzi, M. 1995b. "Variazioni sull'esametro in Teocrito", in M.F. and R. Pretagostini (eds.), *Struttura e storia dell'esametro greco*, vol. 1, Rome, 221–264.
- Fantuzzi, M. 1998. "Textual Misadventures of Daphnis: The Pseudo-Theocritean *Id.* 8 and the Origins of the Bucolic 'Manner'", in Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (eds.), 61–79.
- Fantuzzi, M. 2000. "Theocritus and the Demythologization of Poetry", in M. Depew and D. Obbink (eds.), 138–151.
- Fantuzzi, M. 2003. "Amore pastorale e amore elegiaco, tra Grecia e Roma", in L. Belloni, L. De Finis, and G. Moretti (eds.), *L'officina ellenistica: poesia dotta e popolare in Grecia e a Roma*, Trento, 169–198.
- Fantuzzi, M. 2004. "Philodemus *AP* 5.107 (*GPh* 3188ff.; 32 Sider)", *HSPH* 102, 213–236.
- Fantuzzi, M. and Hunter, R. 2004. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*, (revised and enlarged trans. of *Muse e modelli: la poesia ellenistica da Alessandro Magno ad Augusto*, Rome and Bari 2002) Cambridge.
- Faraone, C.A. 1990. "Aphrodite's ΚΕΣΤΟΣ and Apples for Atalanta: Aphrodisiacs in Early Greek Myth and Ritual", *Phoenix* 44, 224–243.
- Faraone, C.A. 1992. "Aristophanes *Amphiarus* Frag. 29 (Kassel-Austin): Oracular Response or Erotic Incantation?", *CQ* 42, 320–327.
- Faraone, C.A. 1999. *Ancient Greek Love Magic*, Cambridge MA.
- Faraone, C.A. 2001. "The Undercutter, the Woodcutter, and Greek Demon Names Ending in -tomos (Hom. *Hymn to Demeter* 228–229)", *AJPh* 122, 1–10.
- Faraone, C.A. 2005. "When Necromancy Goes Underground: Skull- and Corpse-Divination in the Paris Magical Papyri (*PGM* IV 1928–2144)", in P. Struck and S. Johnston (eds.), *Greek and Roman Divination*, Leiden, 255–286.
- Farr, J. 1991. "Theocritus: Idyll 11", *Hermes* 119, 477–484.
- Farrell, J. 1991a. *Virgil's Georgics and the Traditions of Ancient Epic: The Art of Allusion in Literary History*, Oxford.

- Farrell, J. 1991b. "Asinius Pollio in Vergil *Eclogue* 8", *CPh* 86, 204–211.
- Farrell, J. 1992a. "Literary Allusion and Cultural Poetics in Vergil's Third *Eclogue*", *Vergilius* 38, 64–71.
- Farrell, J. 1992b. "Dialogue of genres in Ovid's Lovesong of Polyphemus (*Met.* 13.719–897)", *AJP* 113, 235–268.
- Fassino, M. and Prauscello, L. 2001. "Memoria ritmica e memoria poetica: Saffo e Alceo in Teocrito, *Idilli* 28–30 tra ἀρχαιολογία metrica e innovazione alessandrina", *MD* 46, 9–37.
- Fear, A.T. 1994. "*Laus Neronis*: the Seventh *Eclogue* of Calpurnius Siculus", *Prometheus* 20, 269–277.
- Ferrari, F. 1988. "P. Berol. 13270: I canti di Elefantina", *SCO* 38, 181–227.
- Ferrini, M.F. 1990. "Le parole e il personaggio: Monologhi nel romanzo greco", *GIF* 42, 45–85.
- Fey-Wickert, B. 2002. *Calpurnius Siculus: Kommentar zur 2. und 3. Ekloge*, Trier.
- Finnegan, R.J. 1992. "Women in Herodian Mime", *Hermathena* 152, 21–37.
- Fish, S. 1980. *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities*, Cambridge MA.
- Fitch, J.G. 1987. *Seneca's Hercules Furens: A Critical Text with Introduction and Commentary*, Ithaca NY and London.
- Flemberg, J. 1991. *Venus Armata*, Stockholm and Göteborg.
- Forbes, H. 1994. "Pastoralism and Settlement Structures in Ancient Greece", in N. Doukellis and L.G. Mendoni (eds.), *Structures rurales et sociétés antiques*, Paris, 187–196.
- Forehand, W.E. 1976. "Symbolic Gardens in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloë*", *Eranos* 74, 103–112.
- Fornaro, S. 2002. "Triphiodoros", in *Der Neue Pauly*, vol. 12.1, 824–826.
- Forsén, J. and Forsén, B. 2003. *The Asea Valley Survey: An Arcadian Mountain Valley from the Palaeolithic Period until Modern Times*, Stockholm.
- Fortenbaugh, W.W. and Schütrumpf, E. (eds.) 2001. *Dicaearchus of Messana: Text, Translation, and Discussion*, New Brunswick and London.
- Fowler, A. 1982. *Kinds of Literature*, Cambridge MA.
- Fowler, B.H. 1989. *The Hellenistic Aesthetic*, Madison.
- Fowler, D.P. 1991. "Narrate and Describe: The Problem of Ecphrasis", *JRS* 81, 25–35 (= Id., *Roman Constructions*, Oxford 2000, 64–85).
- Fowler, D.P. 1995. "Martial and the Book", *Ramus* 24, 31–58.
- Fowler, D.P. 1997. "Virgilian Narrative: Story-telling", in Martindale (ed.), 259–270.
- Fraenkel, E. 1966. "The *Dirae*", *JRS* 56, 142–155.
- Fraistat, N. (ed.) 1986. *Poems in their Place: The Intertextuality and Order of Poetic Collections*, Chapel Hill.
- Fraistat, N. 1986. "Introduction: The Place of the Book and the Book as Place", in Fraistat (ed.), 3–17.
- Fraser, P. 1972. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, Oxford.
- Friedrich, W.H. 1976. *Nachahmung und eigene Gestaltung in der bukolischen Dichtung des Titus Calpurnius Siculus*, Frankfurt/Main.
- Frischer, B. et al. 1999. "Word-Order Transference Between Latin and Greek: The Relative Pronoun of the Accusative Direct Object and the Governing

- Verb in Cassius Dio and Other Greek and Roman Prose Authors", *HSPh* 99, 357–390.
- Fryde, E. 2000. *The Early Palaeologan Renaissance (1261 – c. 1360)*, Leiden.
- Frye, N. 1957. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*, Princeton.
- Funaioli, G. 1939. "Virgilio e Trifiodoro", *RhM* 88, 1–7.
- Furusawa, Y. 1980. *Eros und Seelenruhe in den Thalyisien Theokrits*, Würzburg.
- Fusillo, M. 1989. *Il romanzo greco: Polifonia ed eros*, Venice.
- Gale, M. 1994. *Myth and Poetry in Lucretius*, Cambridge.
- Gale, M. 2000. *Virgil on the Nature of Things: The Georgics, Lucretius, and the Didactic Tradition*, Cambridge.
- Galinsky, G.K. 1965. "Vergil's Second *Eclogue*: Its Theme and Relation to the *Eclogue* Book", *C&M* 26, 161–191 (= Hardie (ed.) (1999), vol. 1, 182–206).
- Gallavotti, C. 1993. *Theocritus quique feruntur bucolici Graeci*, (3rd ed.), Rome.
- Garson, R.W. 1973. "Formal Aspects of Theocritean Comparisons", *CPh* 68, 56–58.
- Garson, R.W. 1974. "The *Eclogues* of Calpurnius: A Partial Apology", *Latomus* 33, 668–672.
- Gärtner, H. (ed.) 1984, *Beiträge zum griechischen Liebesroman*, Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York.
- Garvie, A.F. 1986. *Aeschylus. Choephoroi*. Oxford.
- Gavrilov, A.K. 1997. "Reading Techniques in Classical Antiquity", *CQ* 47, 56–73.
- Gelzer, T. 2002. "Bemerkungen zum Ἀδώνιδος Ἐπιτάφιος des Bion von Smyrna", *Hyperboreus* 8, 256–266.
- Gentili, B. 1988. *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece: From Homer to the Fifth Century*, (Engl. trans.; Rome and Bari 1985, 2nd ed. 1989) Baltimore and London.
- Geoghegan, D. 1979. *Anyte: The Epigrams*, Rome.
- Georgoudi, S. 1974. "Quelques problèmes de la transhumance dans la Grèce ancienne", *REG* 87, 155–185.
- Gerbeau, J. and Vian, F. 1992. *Nonnos de Panopolis. Les Dionysiaques. Tome VII. Chants XVIII–XIX*, Paris.
- Giangrande, G. 1969. Review of Livrea (1968), in *JHS* 81, 149–154.
- Gibbon, E. 1909. *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, (5th ed., by J.B. Bury) London.
- Gibson, B. 2004. "Song Contests in Calpurnius Siculus", *PVS* 25, 1–14.
- Giesecke, A. 2000. *Atoms, Ataraxy, and Allusion: Cross-generic Imitation of the De Rerum Natura in Early Augustan Poetry*, Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York.
- Gifford, T. 1999. *Pastoral*, London.
- Gigante, M. 1979. *Catalogo dei papiri ercolanesi*, Naples.
- Gill, C. 1989. *Longus, Daphnis and Chloe* (trans.), in B.P. Reardon (ed.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 285–348.
- Gillis, D.J. 1967. "Pastoral Poetry in Lucretius", *Latomus* 26, 339–362.
- Goldberg, J. 1986. *Voice Terminal Echo: Postmodernism and English Renaissance Texts*, New York.
- Goldhill, S. 1991. *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature*, Cambridge.

- Goldhill, S. 1994. "The Naive and Knowing Eye: Ecphrasis and the Culture of Viewing in the Hellenistic World", in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds.), *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture*, Cambridge, 197–223.
- Gow, A.S.F. 1952. *Theocritus*, (2nd ed.) Cambridge.
- Gowers, E. 2003. "Fragments of Autobiography in Horace *Satires* 1", *ClAnt* 22, 55–92.
- Graf, F. 1997. *Magic in the Ancient World*, (Engl. trans.; Paris 1994) Cambridge MA.
- Green, P.M. 1982. "Longus, Antiphon and the Topography of Lesbos", *JHS* 102, 210–214.
- Green, R.P.H. 1990. Review of Walter (1988), in *CR* 40, 158.
- Green, R.P.H. 1996. "Octavian and Vergil's Eclogues", *Euphrosyne* 24, 225–236.
- Griffin, A. 1999. "Amorous Pan's Bucolic Rise and Fall", in Morton Braund and Mayer (eds.), 104–122.
- Griffin, J. 1992. "Theocritus, the *Iliad*, and the East", *AJPh* 113, 189–211.
- Griffin, M. 1976. *Seneca, a Philosopher in Politics*, Oxford.
- Griffith, M. 1990. "Contest and Contradiction in Early Greek Poetry", in M.G. and D. Mastronarde (eds.), *Cabinet of the Muses. Essays on Classical and Comparative Literature in Honor of T.G. Rosenmeyer*, Atlanta, 185–208.
- Griffiths, F.T. 1979a. *Theocritus at Court*, Leiden.
- Griffiths, F.T. 1979b. "Poetry as *Pharmakon* in Theocritus' *Idyll* 2", in G.W. Bowersock, W. Burkert, and M.C.J. Putnam (eds.), *Arktouros: Hellenic Studies Presented to B.M.W. Knox on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, Berlin and New York, 81–88.
- Grimal, P. 1969. *Les jardins Romains*, (2nd ed.) Paris.
- Guaglianone, A. 2001. *Le sette egloghe di Calpurnio Siculo*, Naples.
- Guarducci, M. 1939. *Inscriptiones Creticae*, vol. 2, Rome.
- Guthrie, K. 1987. *The Pythagorean Sourcebook and Library: An Anthology of Ancient Writings Which Relate to Pythagoras and Pythagorean Philosophy*, (new ed. by D.R. Fideler) Grand Rapids MI.
- Gutzwiller, K.J. 1983a. "Charites or Hiero: Theocritus' *Idyll* 16", *RhM* 126, 212–238.
- Gutzwiller, K.J. 1983b. "Character and Legend in *Idyll* 8", *TAPhA* 113, 171–182.
- Gutzwiller, K.J. 1986. "The Plant Decoration on Theocritus' Ivy-Cup", *AJPh* 107, 253–255.
- Gutzwiller, K.J. 1991. *Theocritus' Pastoral Analogies: The Formation of a Genre*, Madison and London.
- Gutzwiller, K.J. 1996a. "The Evidence for Theocritean Poetry Books", in Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (eds.), 119–148.
- Gutzwiller, K.J. 1996b. "Vergil and the Date of the Theocritean Epigram Book", *Philologus* 140, 92–99.
- Gutzwiller, K.J. 1998. *Poetic Garlands. Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London.
- Gutzwiller, K.J. 2004. "A New Hellenistic Poetry Book. P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309", in Acosta-Hughes, Kosmetatou, and Baumbach (eds.), 84–93.
- Gutzwiller, K.J. (ed.) 2005. *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, Oxford.

- Habinek, T. 1998. *The Politics of Latin Literature: Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome*, Princeton.
- Halperin, D.M. 1983a. *Before Pastoral: Theocritus and the Ancient Tradition of Bucolic Poetry*, New Haven and London.
- Halperin, D.M. 1983b. "The Forebears of Daphnis", *TAPhA* 113, 183–200.
- Hanslik, R. 1955. "Nachlese zu Vergils Eclogen 1 und 9", *WS* 68, 5–19.
- Harder, M.A. 1992. "Insubstantial Voices: Some Observations on the Hymns of Callimachus", *CQ* 42, 384–394.
- Harder, M.A., Regtuit, R.F., and Wakker, G.C. (eds.) 1994. *Callimachus*, (*Hellenistica Groningana* 1) Groningen.
- Harder, M.A., Regtuit, R.F., and Wakker, G.C. (eds.) 1996. *Theocritus*, (*Hellenistica Groningana* 2) Groningen.
- Harder, M.A., Regtuit, R.F., and Wakker, G.C. (eds.) 1998. *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry*, (*Hellenistica Groningana* 3) Groningen.
- Harder, M.A., Regtuit, R.F., and Wakker, G.C. (eds.) 2002. *Hellenistic Epigrams*, (*Hellenistica Groningana* 5) Leuven.
- Harder, M.A., Regtuit, R.F., and Wakker, G.C. (eds.) 2006. *Beyond the Canon*, (*Hellenistica Groningana* 7) Leuven.
- Hardie, A. 1997. "Philitas and the Plane Tree", *ζPE* 119, 21–36.
- Hardie, P. 1998. *Virgil*, Oxford.
- Hardie, P. (ed.) 1999. *Virgil: Critical Assessments of Classical Authors*, London and New York.
- Hardie, P. 2002. *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion*, Cambridge.
- Hardie, P. (ed.) 2002. *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, Cambridge.
- Hardie, P. 2003. "Approximative Similes in Ovid: Incest and Doubling", *Dicynna* 1, s.n.
- Hardie, P. 2004. "Political Education in Virgil's *Georgics*", *SIFC* 2, 83–111.
- Hardie, P. 2005a. "Nonnus' Typhon: the Musical Giant", in M. Paschalis (ed.), *Roman and Greek Imperial Epic*, Rethymnon, 117–130.
- Hardie, P. 2005b. "Time in Lucretius and the Augustan Poets: Freedom and Innovation", in J.P. Schwindt (ed.), *La représentation du temps dans la poésie augustéenne*, Heidelberg, 19–42.
- Harries, B. 1994. "The Pastoral Mode in the *Dionysiaca*", in Hopkins (ed.), 63–85.
- Harrison, S., Paschalis, M., and Frangoulidis, S., (eds.) 2005. *Metaphor and the Ancient Novel*, (= *Ancient Narrative*, Suppl. 4) Groningen.
- Hartman, J. 1906. "De Plutarchi studiis Latinis", *Mnemosyne* 34, 307–316.
- Hartung, J.A. 1858. *Theokrit, Bion und Moschus*, Leipzig.
- Hathorn, R.Y. 1961. "The Ritual Origin of Pastoral", *TAPhA* 92, 228–238.
- Haubold, J. 2000. *Homer's People: Epic Poetry and Social Formation*, Cambridge.
- Haupt, M. 1875. *Opuscula academica*, Leipzig.
- Hausmann, U. 1958. "Zur Antiope des Euripides: Ein hellenistischer Reliefbecher in Athen", *MDAI(A)* 73, 50–72.
- Headlam, W. and Knox, A.D. 1922. *Herodas. The Mimes and Fragments*, Cambridge.
- Heinze, R. 1993. *Virgil's Epic Technique*, (Engl. trans.; Leipzig 1915, 3rd ed.) Bristol.

- Henderson, J. 1998a. "Virgil, *Eclogue* 3: How Do You Keep an Idiot in Suspense?", *CQ* 48, 213–238.
- Henderson, J. 1998b. "Virgil, *Eclogue* 9: Valleydiction", *PVS* 23, 149–176.
- Henderson, J. 1999. *Writing Down Rome: Satire, Comedy, and Other Offences in Latin Poetry*, Oxford.
- Henrichs, A. 1978. "Greek Maenadism from Olympias to Messalina", *HSPH* 82, 121–160.
- Henrichs, A. 1980. "Riper than a Pear: Parian Invective in Theocritus", *ZPE* 39, 7–27.
- Henrichs, A. 1984. "Loss of Self, Suffering, Violence: The Modern View of Dionysus from Nietzsche to Girard", *HSPH* 88, 205–240.
- Hering, J. 1935. *Lateinisches bei Appian*, Leipzig.
- Herrmann, L. 1981. "Velius Longus auteur de *Daphnis et Chloé*", *Latomus* 40, 378–383.
- Herzog, R. and Schmidt, P.L. 1989. *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike*, vol. 5: *Restauration und Erneuerung: Die lateinische Literatur von 284 bis 374 n. Chr.*, Munich.
- Himmelman-Wildschütz, N. 1972. "Nemesians erste Ekloge", *RhM* 115, 342–356.
- Hinds, S. 1993. "Medea in Ovid: Scenes from the Life of an Intertextual Heroine", *MD* 30, 9–47.
- Hinds, S. 1996. "Books, Poetic", in *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, (3rd ed.) Oxford, 252–253.
- Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext. Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*, Cambridge.
- Hinds, S. 2002. "Landscape with Figures: Aesthetics of Place in the Metamorphoses and its Tradition", in Hardie (ed.) 2002, 122–149.
- Hodkinson, S. 1988. "Animal Husbandry in the Greek Polis", in Whittaker (ed.), 35–74.
- Hodkinson, S. 1990. "Politics as a Determinant of Pastoralism: The Case of Southern Greece, ca. 800–300 B.C.", *Rivista di studi liguri* 56, 139–163.
- Holford-Strevens, L.A. 1993. "Utraque lingua doctus: Some Notes on Bilingualism in the Roman Empire", in Jocelyn (ed.), 203–213.
- Hollander, J. 1981. *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- Hollis, A.S. 1977. *Ovid. Ars Amatoria, Book I*, Oxford.
- Hollis, A.S. 1990. *Callimachus. Hecale*, Oxford.
- Holzinger, C.R. von. 1893. (Der Wiener Philologen-Versammlung als Festgruss überreicht von C.R. von H.) "Ein Idyll des Maximus Planudes", *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien* 44, 385–419.
- Hopkinson, N. 1982. "Juxtaposed Prosodic Variants in Greek and Latin Poetry", *Glotta* 60, 162–177.
- Hopkinson, N. 2000. *Ovid. Metamorphoses, Book XIII*, Cambridge.
- Hopkinson, N. 1988. *A Hellenistic Anthology*, Cambridge.
- Hopkinson, N. (ed.) 1994. *Studies in the Dionysiaca of Nonnus*, Cambridge.
- Hordern, J.H. 1999. "The *Cyclops* of Philoxenus", *CQ* 49, 445–455.
- Horsfall, N.M. (ed.) 1995. *A Companion to the Study of Virgil*, Leiden.

- Horsfall, N.M. 1995. "Virgil: His Life and Times", in Horsfall (ed.), 1–25.
- Horsfall, N.M. 1997. "Criteria for the Dating of Calpurnius Siculus", *RFIC* 125, 166–196.
- Horstmann, A. 1976. *Ironie und Humor bei Theokrit*, Meisenheim/Glan.
- Hubbard, M. 1975. "The Capture of Silenus", *PCPhS* 21, 53–62.
- Hubbard, T.K. 1996. "Calpurnius Siculus and the Unbearable Weight of Tradition", *Helios* 23, 67–89.
- Hubbard, T.K. 1998. *The Pipes of Pan: Intertextuality and Literary Filiation in the Pastoral Tradition from Theocritus to Milton*, Ann Arbor.
- Hunger, H. 1965. *Reich der neuen Mitte: Der christliche Geist der byzantinischen Kultur*, Graz.
- Hunger, H. (with C. Hannick and P.E. Pieler) 1978. *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, Munich.
- Hunter, R. 1983a. *A Study of Daphnis and Chloe*, Cambridge.
- Hunter, R. 1983b. *Eubulus. The Fragments*, Cambridge.
- Hunter, R. 1993. "One Party or Two? Simonides 22 W?", *ΣPE* 99, 11–14.
- Hunter, R. 1994. "Bion and Theocritus: A Note on *Lament for Adonis* v. 55", *MD* 32, 165–168.
- Hunter, R. 1996. *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry*, Cambridge.
- Hunter, R. 1999. *Theocritus. A Selection (Idylls 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11 and 13)*, Cambridge.
- Hunter, R. 2001. "Virgil and Theocritus: A Note on the Reception of the *Encomium to Ptolemy Philadelphus*", *SemRom* 4, 159–163.
- Hunter, R. 2002. "The Sense of an Author: Theocritus and [Theocritus]", in R.K. Gibson and C.S. Kraus (eds.), *The Classical Commentary: Histories, Practices, Theories*, Leiden, 89–108.
- Hunter, R. 2003a. *Theocritus. Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- Hunter, R. 2003b. "Reflecting on Writing and Culture. Theocritus and the Style of Cultural Change", in H. Yunis (ed.), *Written Texts and the Rise of Literate Culture in Ancient Greece*, Cambridge, 213–234.
- Hunter, R. 2006. "The Prologue of the *Periodos to Nicomedes* ("Pseudo-Scymnus")", in Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (eds.), forthcoming.
- Hussey, J.M. 1986. *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*, Oxford.
- Hutchinson, G.O. 1988. *Hellenistic Poetry*, Oxford.
- Hutchinson, G.O. 2001. *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces*, Oxford.
- Irigoin, J. 1975. "Les bucoliques de Théocrite: La composition du recueil", *QUCC* 19, 27–44.
- Irmscher, J. 1985. "Vergil in der griechischen Antike", *Klio* 67, 281–285.
- Isager, S. and Skydsgaard, J.E. 1992. *Ancient Greek Agriculture: An Introduction*, London and New York.
- Isenberg, C. and Konstan, D. 1984. "Pastoral Desire: The Third Idyll of Theocritus", *Dalhousie Review* 64, 302–315.
- Iser, W. 1980. "Interaction Between Text and Reader", in S.R. Suleiman and I. Crosman (eds.), *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation*, Princeton, 106–119.

- Jameson, F. 1981. *The Political Unconscious*, Ithaca NY.
- Jameson, M.H., Runnels, C.W., and van Andel, T.H. 1994. *A Greek Countryside: The Southern Argolid from Prehistory to the Present Day*, Stanford.
- Jenkyns, R. 1998. *Virgil's Experience: Nature and History: Times, Names, and Places*, Oxford.
- Jocelyn, H.D. (with the assistance of H. Hurt) (ed.) 1993. *Tria Lustra: Essays and Notes Presented to J. Pinsent*, Liverpool.
- Johnson, W.A. 2000. "Toward a Sociology of Reading in Classical Antiquity", *AJPh* 121, 593–627.
- Jordan, D.R. 1992. "The Inscribed Lead Tablet from Phalasarna", *ŽPE* 94, 191–194.
- Jordan, D.R. 2000. "Three Texts from Lokroi Epizephyrioi", *ŽPE* 130, 96–101.
- Jouanno, C. 1989. "Nicéas Eugénianos: Un héritier du roman grec", *REG* 102, 346–360.
- Kaiser, E. 1964. "Odyssee-Szenen als Topoi", *MH* 21, 109–136 and 197–224.
- Kambitsis, J. 1972. *L'Antiope d'Euripide*, Athens.
- Kambylis, A. 1965. *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik*, Heidelberg.
- Kazhdan, A. and Franklin, S. 1984. *Studies on Byzantine Literature of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*, Cambridge.
- Keith, A.M. 2000. *Engendering Rome: Women in Latin Epic*, Cambridge.
- Kennedy, D.F. 1987. "Arcades ambo: Virgil, Gallus and Arcadia", *Hermathena* 143, 47–59.
- Kenney, E.J. 1983. "Virgil and the Elegiac Sensibility", *ICS* 8, 46–52 (= Hardie (ed.) (1999) vol. 1, 68–83).
- Kenney, E.J. 1986. "Introduction and Notes", in Id., *Ovid. Metamorphoses*, Oxford.
- Kenney, E.J. 1999. "*Vt erat nouator*: Anomaly, Innovation, and Genre in Ovid, *Heroides* 16–21", in J.N. Adams and R.G. Mayer (eds.), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry* (= *Proceedings of the British Academy* 93), London, 399–414.
- Kenyon, F.G. 1951. *Books and Readers in Greece and Rome*, (2nd ed.) Oxford.
- Keppie, L. 1981. "Vergil, the Confiscations, and Caesar's Tenth Legion", *CQ* 31, 367–370.
- Keydell, R. 1927. "Zur Komposition der Bücher 13–40 der Dionysiaka des Nonnos", *Hermes* 62, 393–434 (= Keydell (1982) 443–484).
- Keydell, R. 1932. "Eine Nonnos-Analyse", *AC* 1, 173–202 (= Keydell (1982) 485–514).
- Keydell, R. 1954. "Quintus von Smyrna und Vergil", *Hermes* 82, 254–256 (= Keydell (1982) 373–378).
- Keydell, R. 1959. *Nonni Panopolitani Dionysiaca*, Berlin.
- Keydell, R. 1963. "Quintus von Smyrna", *RE* 24, 1271–1296.
- Keydell, R. 1982. *Kleine Schriften zur hellenistischen und spätgriechischen Dichtung (1911–1976)*, (ed. W. Peek) Leipzig.
- Khan, H.A. 1967. "Catullus 99 and Other Kiss-Poems", *Latomus* 26, 609–618.
- Kirstein, R. 2002. "Companion Pieces in the Hellenistic Epigram", in Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (eds.), 113–135.
- Kleve, K. 1989. "Lucretius in Herculaneum", *CErc* 19, 5–27.
- Kleve, K. 1990. "Ennius in Herculaneum", *CErc* 20, 5–16.

- Kleve, K. 1994. "The Latin Papyri in Herculaneum", in A. Bülow-Jacobsen (ed.), *Proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Papyrologists*, Copenhagen, 382–383.
- Kleve, K. 2001. "Caecilius Statius, 'The Money-Lender'", in I. Andorlini (ed.), *Atti del XXII congresso internazionale di papirologia*, vol. 2, Florence, 725.
- Knaack, G. 1905. "Ein verlorenes Epyll des Bion von Smyrna", *Hermes* 40, 336–340.
- Knox, P.E. 1985. "Wine, Water, and Callimachean Polemics", *HSPH* 89, 109–119.
- Koenen, L. 1977. *Eine agonistische Inschrift aus Ägypten und frühptolemäische Königsfeste*, Meisenheim/Glan.
- Köhnken, A. 1965. *Apollonios Rhodios und Theokrit*, Göttingen.
- Köhnken, A. 1984. "'Sola ... tua carmina' (Vergil, Ecl. 8,9f.)", *WJA* 10, 77–90.
- Köhnken, A. 1995. "Theokrit 1950–1994 (1996): 1. Teil", *Lustrum* 37, 203–307.
- Köhnken, A. 1996. "Theokrits Polyphemgedichte", in Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (eds.), 171–186.
- Köhnken, A. 1999. "Theokrit 1950–1998: 2. Teil", *Lustrum* 41, 9–63 and 197–204 ("Addenda zu Theokrit 1. Teil": *Lustrum* 41, 65–73).
- Köhnken, A. 2001. "Hellenistic Chronology: Theocritus, Callimachus, and Apollonius Rhodius", in T.D. Papanghelis and A. Rengakos (eds.), *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius*, Leiden, 73–93.
- Konstan, D. 1991. "The Death of Argus, or What Stories Do", *Helios* 18, 15–30.
- Konstan, D. 1994. *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres*, Princeton.
- Koortbojian, M. 1995. *Myth, Meaning, and Memory on Roman Sarcophagi*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- Korenjak, M. 2003. "Tityri sub persona: der antike Biographismus und die bukolische Tradition", *A&A* 49, 58–79.
- Korzeniewski, D. 1966. "Die 'panegyrische Tendenz' in den Carmina Einsiedlensia", *Hermes* 94, 344–360.
- Korzeniewski, D. 1972. "Die Eklogen des Calpurnius Siculus als Gedichtbuch", *MH* 29, 214–216.
- Kossaifi, C. 2002. "L'onomastique bucolique dans les *Idylles* de Théocrite", *REA* 104, 349–361.
- Krevans, N. 1983. "Geography and the Literary Tradition in Theocritus 7", *TAPhA* 113, 201–220.
- Krevans, N. 1984. *The Poet as Editor: Callimachus, Virgil, Horace, Propertius and the Development of the Poetic Book*, Diss. Princeton.
- Kroll, W. 1924. *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur*, Stuttgart.
- Küppers, J. 1985. "Die Faunus-Prophezeiung in der 1. Ekloge des Calpurnius Siculus", *RhM* 133, 350–370.
- Küppers, J. 1989. "Tityrus in Rom—Bemerkungen zu einem vergilischen Thema und seiner Rezeptionsgeschichte", *ICS* 14, 33–47.
- Labarthe-Postel, J. 2001. "Hommes et dieux dans les *ekphraseis* des romans byzantins du temps des Comnène", in B. Pouderon, C. Hunzinger, and

- D. Kasprzyk (eds.), *Les personnages du roman grec (Actes du colloque de Tours, 18–20 novembre 1999)*, Lyon, 347–371.
- Lackner, M. 1996. “Überlegungen zur Rahmenhandlung der dritten Ekloge Nemesians”, *RhM* 139, 41–52.
- Langholf, V. 1990. “Vergil-Allegorese in den Bucolica des Calpurnius Siculus”, *RhM* 133, 350–370.
- Lardinois, A. 1996. “Who Sang Sappho’s Songs?”, in E. Greene (ed.), *Reading Sappho: Contemporary Approaches*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 150–172.
- Lardinois, A. and McClure, L. (eds.) 2001. *Making Silence Speak: Women’s Voices in Greek Literature and Society*, Princeton.
- Laroche, E. 1949. *Histoire de la racine NEM- en grec ancien*, Paris.
- Larson, V.T. 1994. *The Role of Description in Senecan Tragedy*, Frankfurt/Main.
- Laugesen, A.T. 1962. “La Roue de Virgile: Une page de la théorie littéraire du Moyen Age”, *C&M* 23, 248–273.
- Lavagne, H. 1988. *Operosa antra: Recherches sur la grotte à Rome de Sylla à Hadrien*, Rome.
- Lawall, G. 1967. *Theocritus’ Coan Pastorals: A Poetry Book*, Washington DC and Cambridge MA.
- Leach, E.W. 1973. “Corydon Revisited: An Interpretation of the Political Eclogues of Calpurnius Siculus”, *Ramus* 2, 53–97.
- Leach, E.W. 1974. *Vergil’s Eclogues: Landscapes of Experience*, Ithaca NY.
- Leach, E.W. 1975. “Neronian Pastoral and the World of Power”, in Boyle (ed.), 204–230.
- Lee, A.G. 1984. *Virgil. The Eclogues*, Harmondsworth (original edition Liverpool 1980).
- Lefkowitz, M. 1981. *The Lives of the Greek Poets*. London.
- Legrand, P.É. 1898. *Étude sur Théocrite*, Paris.
- Lelli, E. 2004. *Critica e polemica letteraria nei Giambi di Callimaco*, Alessandria.
- Lentini, G. 1998. “Amore ‘fuori luogo’: presenze saffiche ed esiodee nell’idillio 10 di Teocrito”, *SCO* 46, 903–907.
- Leo, F. 1903. “Vergils erste und neunte Ekloge”, *Hermes* 38, 1–18.
- Levi, D. 1941. “The Allegories of the Months in Classical Art”, *Art Bulletin* 23, 251–291.
- Lightfoot, J.L. 1999. *Parthenius of Nicaea. The Poetical Fragments and the Erotika pathemata*, Oxford.
- Lipka, M. 2001. *Language in Vergil’s Eclogues*, Berlin and New York.
- Littlewood, A.R. 1972. *The Progymasmata of Ioannes Geometres*, Amsterdam.
- Littlewood, A.R. 1979. “Romantic Paradises: The Rôle of the Garden in the Byzantine Romance”, *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 5, 95–114.
- Littlewood, A.R. (ed.) 1995. *Originality in Byzantine Literature, Art and Music: A Collection of Essays*, Oxford.
- Littlewood, C.J.A. 2004. *Self-Representation and Illusion in Senecan Tragedy*, Oxford.
- Livrea, E. 1968. *Colluto. Il ratto di Elena*. Bologna.
- Livrea, E. 2004. “Un epigramma di Posidippo e il *Cyclops* di Filosseno di Citera”, *ŽPE* 146, 41–46.
- Longo, O. 1978. “Paesaggio di Longo Sofista”, *QS* 8, 99–120.

- Lonsdale, S. 1990. *Creatures of Speech: Lion, Herding, and Hunting Similes in the Iliad*, Stuttgart.
- Lotman, Y.M. 1982. "The Text and the Structure of its Audience", *New Literary History* 14, 81–87.
- Lowrie, M. 2002. "Beyond Performance Envy: Horace and the Modern in the *Epistle to Augustus*", in Paschalis (ed.), 141–171.
- Luck, G. 1957. "The Cave and the Source (on the Imagery of Propertius 3.1.1–6)", *CQ* 7, 175–179.
- Luck, G. 1966. "Zur Deutung von Theokrits Thalysien", *MH* 23, 186–189.
- Luck, G. 1967. Review of *HE*, in *GGA* 219, 23–61.
- Ludwig, W. 1968. "Die Kunst der Variation im hellenistischen Liebesepigramm", in O. Reverdin (ed.), *L'épigramme grecque, (Entrétiens sur l'antiquité classique 14)* Vandœuvres/Geneva, 297–348.
- Luria, S. 1963. "Herondas' Kampf für die veristische Kunst", in *Miscellanea di studi alessandrini in memoria di A. Rostagni*, Turin, 394–415.
- Luther, A. 2002. *Historische Studien zu den Bucolica Vergils*, Vienna.
- MacAlister, S. 1991. "Byzantine Twelfth-Century Romances: A Relative Chronology", *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 15, 175–210.
- MacQueen, B.D. 1990. *Myth, Rhetoric, and Fiction: A Reading of Longus's Daphnis and Chloe*, Lincoln NE and London.
- Magdalino, P. 1993. *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180*, Cambridge.
- Magnelli, E. 1999. *Alexandri Aetoli testimonia et fragmenta*, Florence.
- Maguire, H. 1993. "Christians, Pagans and the Representation of Nature", in *Begegnung von Heidentum und Christentum im spätantiken Ägypten*, Riggisberg 131–160 (= chap. 6 in Id., *Rhetoric, Nature and Magic in Byzantine Art*, Aldershot 1998).
- Maguire, H. 1997. "Images of the Court", in H.C. Evans and W.D. Wixom (eds.), *The Glory of Byzantium: Art and Culture of the Middle Byzantine Era, A.D. 843–1261*, New York, 182–191.
- Manakidou, F. 1994. "Bemerkungen über die Beziehung zwischen Dichtung und bildender Kunst. Bions Klage um Adonis und Theokrits 15. Idyll", *Prometheus* 20, 104–118.
- Mankin, D. 1988. "The Addressee of Virgil's Eighth Eclogue: A Reconsideration", *Hermes* 116, 63–76.
- Mankin, D. 1995. *Horace. Epodes*, Cambridge.
- Mansi, J.D. 1765. *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, vol. 11, Graz.
- Manuwald, B. 1990. "Der Kyklops als Dichter: Bemerkungen zu Theokrit, Eid. 11", in Steinmetz (ed.), 77–91.
- Marchiò, M. 1957. "Un componimento georgico sulle orme di Virgilio: l'egloga V di Calpurnio Siculo", *GIF* 10, 301–314.
- Marcovich, M. 1992. *Theodori Prodromi De Rhodanthes et Dosiclis amoribus libri IX*, Stuttgart and Leipzig.
- Marcovich, M. 2001. *Eustathius Macrembolites. De Hysmines et Hysminiae amoribus libri XI*, Munich.
- Marin, D. 1969. "Dionisio d' Alicarnasso e il latino", in *Hommages à M. Renard*, Brussels, 595–607.
- Martin, B. 1996. "Calpurnius Siculus' 'New' Aurea Aetas", *AClass* 39, 17–38.

- Martin, B. 2003. "Calpurnius Siculus: The Ultimate Imperial 'Toady'?", in A.F. Basson and W.J. Dominik (eds.), *Literature, Art, History: Studies on Classical Antiquity and Tradition in Honour of W.J. Henderson*, Frankfurt/Main, Berlin, and Bern, 73–90.
- Martindale, C. (ed.) 1997. *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, Cambridge.
- Martindale, C. 1997. "Green Politics: The *Eclogues*", in Martindale (ed.), 107–124.
- Mason, H.J. 1979. "Longus and the Topography of Lesbos", *TAPhA* 109, 149–163.
- Massimilla, G. 1996. *Callimaco, Aitia: libri primo e secondo*, Pisa.
- Masters, J. 1992. *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's Bellum civile*, Cambridge.
- Matranga, P. 1850. *Anecdota graeca e mss. bibliothecis Vaticanae, Angelicae, Barberiniana, Vallicelliana, Medicea, Vindobonensi deprompta*, Rome.
- Matthews, R.J.H. 1990. "The Lament for Adonis. Questions of Authorship", *Antichthon* 24, 32–52.
- Matthews, R.J.H. 1994. "A Sylloge of Minor Bucolic", *Antichthon* 28, 25–51.
- Matthews, V.J. 1996. *Antimachus of Colophon*, Leiden.
- Maury, P. 1944. "Le secret de Virgile et l'architecture des Bucoliques", *Lettres d'Humanité* 3, 71–147.
- Mayer, R.G. 1980. "Calpurnius Siculus: Technique and Date", *JRS* 70, 175–176.
- Mayer, R.G. 1983a. "Missing Persons in the *Eclogues*", *BICS* 30, 17–30.
- Mayer, R.G. 1983b. "Neronian Classicism", *AJPh* 103, 305–318.
- McCail, R.C. 1988. "Did Constantine of Sicily Read *Daphnis and Chloe*?", *Byzantion* 58, 112–122.
- McCulloh, W. Unpublished. "Lugete, o Veneres Cupidinesque".
- Meillier, C. 1982. "La fonction thérapeutique de la musique et de la poésie dans le recueil des *Bucoliques* de Théocrite", *BAGB* 41, 164–186.
- Merfeld, B. 1999. *Panegyrik—Paränese—Parodie?: die Einsiedler Gedichte und Herrscherlob in neronischer Zeit*, Trier.
- Merkelbach, R. 1956. "BOYKOΛΙΑΣΤΑΙ (der Wettgesang der Hirten)", *RhM* 99, 97–133.
- Merkelbach, R. 1957. "Sappho und ihr Kreis", *Philologus* 101, 1–29.
- Merrill, W.A. 1918. "Parallels and Coincidences in Lucretius and Virgil", *Univ. of California Publ. in Class. Phil.* 3.3, 135–247.
- Mesk, J. 1912–1913. "Lucians Nigrinus und Juvenal", *WS* 34, 373–382, and 35, 1–33.
- Messina, C. 1975. *T. Calpurnio Siculo*, Padua.
- Milazzo, A.M. 1985. "Motivi bucolici e tecnica alessandrina in due *idilli* di Niceta Eugenio", *Studi di filologia bizantina* 3, 97–114.
- Miles, G.B. 1980. *Virgil's Georgics. A new interpretation*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- Miller, H.J. 2001. *Speech Acts in Literature*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- Miner, E. 1986. "Some Issues for Study of Integrated Collections", in Fraistat (ed.), 18–43.
- Mittelstadt, M.C. 1966. "Longus: *Daphnis and Chloe* in the Pastoral Tradition", *C&M* 27, 162–177.

- Mittelstadt, M.C. 1970. "Bucolic-Lyric Motifs and Dramatic Narrative in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloë*", *RhM* 113, 211–227.
- Mizera, S.M. 1982. "Lucretian Elements in Menalcas' Song, *Eclogue* 5", *Hermes* 110, 367–371.
- Molinos Tejada, T. 1990. *Los dorismos del Corpus Bucolicorum*, Amsterdam.
- Möller, A. 2000. *Naukratis: Trade in Archaic Greece*, Oxford.
- Morgan, J.R. 2004. *Longus. Daphnis and Chloë*, Oxford.
- Morgan, L. 1999. *Patterns of Redemption in Virgil's Georgics*, Cambridge.
- Morgan, L. 2003. "Child's Play: Ovid and his Critics", *JRS* 93, 66–91.
- Morris, C. 1971. *Writings on the General Theory of Signs*, The Hague.
- Morton Braund, S. and Mayer, R. (eds.) 1999. *amor:roma. Love & Latin Literature*, Cambridge.
- Most, G.W. 1987. "The 'Virgilian' *Culex*", in Michael Whitby, P. Hardie, Mary Whitby (eds.), *Homo viator. Classical Essays for J. Bramble*, Bristol and Oak Park IL, 199–209.
- Mugellesi, R. 1973. "Il senso della natura in Seneca tragico", in *Argentea Aetas: In memoriam E.V. Marmorale*, Genoa, 29–66.
- Müller, C.W. 1990. "Philetas oder Philitas?", in Steinmetz (ed.), 27–37 (= C.W.M., *Kleine Schriften zur antiken Literatur und Geistesgeschichte*, Stuttgart and Leipzig 1999, 496–508).
- Mullett, M.E. 1995. "Originality in the Byzantine Letter: The Case of Exile", in Littlewood (ed.), 39–58.
- Mumprecht, V. 1964. *Epitaphios Bionos*, Diss. Bern, Zurich.
- Murgatroyd, A.P. 2001. "Ovid's *Syrinx*", *CQ* 51, 620–623.
- Murray, O. 1990. "The Idea of the Shepherd King", in P. Godman and O. Murray (eds.), *Latin Poetry and the Classical Tradition: Essays in Medieval and Renaissance Literature*, Oxford, 1–14.
- Murray, O. (ed.) 1990. *Symptomata. A Symposium on the Symposium*, Oxford.
- Mylonas, G. 1961. *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, Princeton.
- Naumann, H. and Brugnoli, G. 1990. "Vitae Vergilianae", in *Enciclopedia virgiliana*, vol. 5*, 570–588.
- Nauta, R.R. 1990. "Gattungsgeschichte als Rezeptionsgeschichte am Beispiel der Entstehung der Bukolik", *A&A* 36, 116–137.
- Nauta, R.R. 2002. *Poetry for Patrons. Literary Communication in the Age of Domitian*, Leiden.
- Nauta, R.R. 2006a. "The *recusatio* in Flavian Poetry", in R.R.N., H.J. van Dam, and J.J.L. Smolenaars (eds.) 2006. *Flavian Poetry*, Leiden, 21–40.
- Nauta, R.R. 2006b. "Singing Like a Boy. Intertextual Notes on Callimachus, fr. 1.21–24 Pf.", *Mnemosyne* 59, forthcoming.
- Nelis, D. 2004. "From Didactic to Epic: *Georgics* 2.458–3.48", in M. Gale (ed.), *Latin Epic and Didactic Poetry. Genre, Tradition and Individuality*, Swansea, 73–107.
- Neumeister, C. 1975. "Vergils IX Ekloge im Vergleich zu Theokrits 7. Idyll", in J. Cobet, R. Leimbach, and A.B. Neschke-Hentschke (eds.), *Dialogos (Für H. Patzer zum 65. Geburtstag)*, Wiesbaden, 177–185.
- Newlands, C. 1987. "Urban pastoral. The Seventh Eclogue of Calpurnius Siculus", *ClAnt* 6, 218–231.

- Nickau, K. 2002a. "Der Name "Simichidas" bei Theokrit", *Hermes* 130, 389–403.
- Nickau, K. 2002b. "Zur Epiphanie des Eros im Hirtenroman des Longos", *Hermes* 130, 176–191.
- Nicolson, M.H. 1959. *Mountain Gloom and Mountain Glory: The Development of the Aesthetics of the Infinite*, New York.
- Nilsson, I. 2001. *Erotic Pathos, Rhetorical Pleasure: Narrative Technique and Mimesis in Eumathios Makrembolites' Hysmine and Hysminias*, Uppsala.
- Nisbet, R.G.M. 1978. "Virgil's Fourth *Eclogue*: Easterners and Westerners", *BICS* 25, 59–78 (= Nisbet (1995) 47–75; = Hardie (ed.) (1999), vol. 1, 256–282).
- Nisbet, R.G.M. 1993. "Adulescens puer (Virgil, *Eclogues* 4. 28–30)", in Jocelyn (ed.), 265–267 (= Nisbet (1995), 381–389).
- Nisbet, R.G.M. 1995. *Collected Papers on Latin Literature*, (ed. S.J. Harrison) Oxford.
- Nisbet, R.G.M. and M. Hubbard. 1970. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes. Book I*, Oxford.
- Nisbet, R.G.M. and M. Hubbard. 1978. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes. Book II*, Oxford.
- Nissen, T. 1936. "Die Aristeas-Legende im Idyll des Planudes", *ByzZ* 36, 291–299.
- Noack, F. 1892. "Die Quellen des Trifiodoros", *Hermes* 27, 452–463.
- Nováková, J. 1964. *Umbra: Ein Beitrag zur Dichterischen Semantik*, Berlin.
- Obbink, D. 1993. "The Addresses of Empedocles", *MD* 31, 51–98.
- O'Hara, J.J. 1996. *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*, Ann Arbor.
- Ohr, F. 1929. "Fluchtafel und Wettersegen", *Folklore Fellows Communications* 86, 1–2.
- Ong, W.J. 1977. *Interfaces of the Word: Studies in the Evolution of Consciousness and Culture*, Ithaca NY and London.
- Orlando, F. 1993. *Gli oggetti desueti nelle immagini della letteratura: Rovine, reliquie, rarità, robaccia, luoghi inabitati e tesori nascosti*, Turin.
- Orsini, P. 1972. *Collouthos. L'enlèvement d'Hélène*, Paris.
- Osgood, J. 2006. *Caesar's Legacy: Civil War and the Emergence of the Roman Empire*, Cambridge.
- Ostern, H. 1915. "Syrinx", in *Ausführl. Lex. Mythologie*, vol. 4, 1642–1644.
- Otis, B. 1964. *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry*, Oxford.
- Ott, U. 1969. *Die Kunst des Gegensatzes in Theokrits Hirtengedichten*, Hildesheim.
- Ott, U. 1972. "Theokrits "Thalysien" und ihre literarischen Vorbilder", *RhM* 115, 134–149.
- Pack, R.A. 1965. *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Graeco-Roman Egypt*, (2nd ed.) Ann Arbor.
- Pandiri, Th.A. 1985. "Daphnis and Chloe: The Art of Pastoral Play", *Ramus* 14, 116–141.
- Papanghelis, T.D. 1999. "Eros Pastoral and Profane: On Love in Virgil's *Eclogues*", in Morton Braund and Mayer (eds.), 44–59.
- Parry, H. 1964. "Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: Violence in a Pastoral Landscape", *TAPA* 95, 268–282.

- Parry, H. 1987. "Circe and the Poets: Theocritus IX.35–36", *ICS* 12, 7–21.
- Paschalis, M. 1995a. "Ἔλνξερόν στόμα: Erotic Homer in the Lament of Bion", *MD* 34, 179–185.
- Paschalis, M. 1995b. "Vergil's Sixth Eclogue and the *Lament for Bion*", *AJPh* 116, 617–621.
- Paschalis, M. (ed.) 2002. *Horace and Greek Lyric Poetry*, Rethymnon.
- Paschalis, M. and Frangoulidis, S. (eds.), 2002. *Space in the Ancient Novel*, (= *Ancient Narrative Suppl.* 1), Groningen, 27–39.
- Paschalis, M. 2005. "The Narrator as Hunter: Longus, Virgil and Theocritus", in Harrison, Paschalis, and Frangoulidis (eds.), 50–67.
- Patterson, A. 1987. *Pastoral and Ideology: Virgil to Valéry*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- Pattoni, M.P. 2004. "I Pastoralia di Longo e la contaminazione dei generi", *MD* 53, 83–123.
- Pavel, T.G. 1986. *Fictional Worlds*, Cambridge MA.
- Payne, M. 2006. *Theocritus and the Invention of Fiction*, Cambridge.
- Pelling, C.B.R. 1979. "Plutarch's Method of Work in his Roman Lives", *JHS* 99, 74–96.
- Pellizer, E. and Tedeschi, G. 1983. "Poesie conviviali in un papiro di Elefantina", *Quaderni di Filologia Classica, Univers. di Trieste*, 4, 5–24.
- Percival, H.R. 1900. *The Seven Ecumenical Councils*, New York.
- Perkell, C. 1990. "Virgilian Scholarship in the Nineties: *Eclogues*", *Vergilius* 36, 43–55.
- Perkell, C. 2001. "Vergil Reading His Twentieth-Century Readers: A Study of *Eclogue* 9", *Vergilius* 47, 64–88.
- Perrotta, G. 1925. "Studi di poesia ellenistica", *SIFC* 4, 5–68 and 85–280.
- Perutelli, A. 1976. "Natura selvatica e genere bucolico", *ASNP* 6, 763–798.
- Perutelli, A. 1995. "Bucolics", in Horsfall (ed.), 27–62.
- Petrini, M. 1997. *The Child and the Hero. Coming of Age in Catullus and Vergil*, Ann Arbor.
- Petrounias, E. 1976. *Funktion und Thematik der Bilder bei Aischylos*, Göttingen.
- Pfeiffer, R. 1949/53. *Callimachus*, Oxford.
- Piacenza, N. 1994. "Sul finale dell'idillio IX del corpus teocriteo", *Aevum(ant)* 7, 163–169.
- Plepelits, K. 1989. *Eustathios Makrembolites*. Hysmine und Hysminias, Stuttgart.
- Poggioli, R. 1975. *The Oaten Flute: Essays on Pastoral Poetry and the Pastoral Ideal*, Cambridge.
- Pontani, F.M. 1973. *Maximi Planudis Idyllium*, Padua.
- Porro, A. 1988. "L'Adonidis Epitaphium di Bione e il modello teocriteo", *Aevum(ant)* 1, 211–221.
- Porro, A. 1999. "Mosco di Siracusa, poeta e grammatico", *Eikasmos* 10, 125–135.
- Posch, S. 1969. *Beobachtungen zur Theokritnachwirkung bei Vergil*, Innsbruck and Munich.
- Pöschl, V. 1964. *Die Hirtendichtung Virgils*, Heidelberg.
- Powell, B.B. 1976. "Poeta Ludens: Thrust and Counter-thrust in *Eclogue* 3", *ICS* 1, 113–121.

- Pretagostini, R. 1980. "La struttura compositiva dei carmi teocritei", *QUCC* 34, 57–74.
- Pretagostini, R. 1984. *Ricerche sulla poesia alessandrina: Teocrito, Callimaco, Sotade*. Rome.
- Pretagostini, R. 1992. "Tracce di poesia orale nei carmi di Teocrito", *Aevum-(ant)* 5, 67–87.
- Pretagostini, R. 1997. "La ripresa teocritea della poesia erotica arcaica e tardoarcaica (Idd. 29 e 30)", *MD* 38, 9–24.
- Pretagostini, R. 1999. "Teocrito: la poesia bucolica e la realtà campestre nella poesia non bucolica", in G. Ramires (ed.), *Teocrito nella storia della poesia bucolica*, Milazzo, 1–22.
- Pucci, P. 1977. *Hesiod and the Language of Poetry*. Baltimore and London.
- Puelma, M. 1960. "Die Dichterbegegnung in Theokrits *Thalysien*", *MH* 17, 144–164 (= Id., *Labor et lima: Kleine Schriften und Nachträge*, Basel 1995, 217–243, with an "Addendum" and an "Anhang").
- Putnam, M.C.J. 1970. *Virgil's Pastoral Art: Studies in the Eclogues*, Princeton.
- Putnam, M.C.J. 1975. "Virgil's First Eclogue: Poetics of Enclosure", in Boyle (ed.), 81–104.
- Quaeghebeur, J. 1983. "Cultes égyptiens et grecs en Égypte hellénistique", *Studia Hellenistica* 27, 301–324.
- Radici Colace, P. 1971. "La tecnica compositiva dell'ἑραστής pseudo-teocriteo (Idillio XXIII)", *GIF* 23, 325–346.
- Radt, S.L. 1971. "Theocritea", *Mnemosyne* 24, 251–259.
- Ramsey, J.T. and Licht, A.L. 1997. *The Comet of 44 B.C. and Caesar's Funeral Games*, Atlanta.
- Reardon, B.P. 1969. "The Greek Novel", *Phoenix* 23, 291–309 (= Gärtner (ed.) (1984), 218–236).
- Reardon, B.P. 1994. "Μῦθος οὐ λόγος: Longus's *Lesbian Pastorals*", in Tatum (ed.), 135–147.
- Redfield, J. 2003. *The Locrian Maidens*, Princeton.
- Reed, J.D. 1997. *Bion of Smyrna: The Fragments and the Adonis*, Cambridge.
- Reed, J.D. 2000. "Arsinoe's Adonis and the Poetics of Ptolemaic Imperialism", *TAPhA* 130, 319–351.
- Reed, J.D. 2004. "A Hellenistic influence in *Aeneid IX*", *Faventia* 26.1, 29–44.
- Reeve, M.D. 1982. *Longus. Daphnis et Chloe*, Leipzig.
- Reeve, M.D. 1986. Account of the textual tradition of Calpurnius and Nemesianus, in L.D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission*, Oxford, 37–38.
- Reichmann, V. 1943. *Römische Literatur in griechischer Übersetzung*, (*Philologus Suppl.* 34.3) Leipzig.
- Reitzenstein, R. 1893. *Epigramm und Skolion: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der alexandrinischen Dichtung*, Giessen.
- Reitzenstein, E. 1931. "Zur Stiltheorie des Kallimachos", in *Festschrift Richard Reitzenstein zum 2. April 1931 dargebracht*, Leipzig and Berlin, 23–69.
- Renahan, R. 1965. "Theocritus (?) VIII, 53–56", *RhM* 108, 372.
- Rhalles, G.A. and Potles, M. (eds.) 1852. *Σύνταγμα τῶν θεῶν καὶ ἱερῶν κανόνων*, vol. 2, Athens.
- Richardson, N.J. 1974. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Oxford.

- Richter, G.M.A. 1930. *Animals in Greek Sculpture: A Survey*, New York.
- Robert, L. 1977. "La titulature de Nicée et de Nicomédie: la gloire et la haine", *HSPh* 31, 1–39 (= Id., *Opera minora selecta*, vol. 6, Amsterdam, 1989, 211–249).
- Rochette, B. 1997. *Le latin dans le monde grec*, Brussels.
- Rohde, E. 1914. *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*, (3rd ed.) Leipzig and Berlin.
- Rohde, G. 1937. "Longus und die Bukolik", *RhM* 86, 23–49 (= Id., *Studien und Interpretationen zur antiken Literatur, Religion und Geschichte*, Berlin 1963, 91–116; = Effe (ed.) (1986), 374–401).
- Rosenmeyer, T.G. 1969. *The Green Cabinet. Theocritus and the European Pastoral Lyric*, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London.
- Rosenmeyer, P.A. 1992. *The Poetics of Imitation: Anacreon and the Anacreontic Tradition*, Cambridge.
- Rosenmeyer, P.A. 2004. "Girls at Play in Early Greek Poetry", *AJPh* 125, 163–178.
- Ross, D.O. 1975. *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy, and Rome*, Cambridge.
- Rossi, Luigi Enrico. 1971a. "Mondo pastorale e poesia bucolica di maniera: l'idillio ottavo del corpus teocriteo", *SIFC* 43, 5–25.
- Rossi, L.E. 1971b. "I generi letterari e le loro leggi scritte e non scritte nelle letterature classiche", *BICS* 18, 69–94.
- Rossi, L.E. 1972. "L'Illa di Teocrito: epistola poetica ed epillio", in *Studi classici in onore di Q. Cataudella*, Catania, 279–293.
- Rossi, L.E. 1983. "Il simposio greco arcaico e classico come spettacolo a se stesso", in *Spettacoli conviviali dall'antichità classica alle corti italiane del '400*, Viterbo, 41–50.
- Rossi, L.E. 2000. "Origine e finalità del prodotto pseudepigrapho. Pseudepigrafia preterintenzionale nel *Corpus Theocriteum*. L'idillio VIII", in G. Cerri (ed.), *La letteratura pseudepigrapha nella cultura greca e romana (Atti di un incontro di studi, Napoli, 15–17 gennaio 1998)* (= *AION*(filol.) 22), Naples, 231–261.
- Rossi, Laura. 2001. *The Epigrams Ascribed to Theocritus: A Method of Approach*, Leuven and Sterling, VA.
- Roux, J. 1970–1972. *Euripide. Les Bacchantes*, Paris.
- Rudd, N. 1976. *Lines of Enquiry: Studies in Latin Poetry*, Cambridge.
- Ruggeri, E. 2002. "Calpurnio Siculo e l'età di Nerone", *InvLuc* 24, 201–243.
- Rumpf, L. 1996. *Extremus labor. Vergils 10. Ekloge und die Poetik der Bukolika*, Göttingen.
- Rundin, J. 2003. "The Epicurean Morality of Vergil's *Bucolics*", *CW* 96, 159–176.
- Ryder, M.L. 1983. *Sheep & Man*, London.
- Sbardella, L. 2000. *Filila. Testimonianze e frammenti poetici*, Rome.
- Scarcella, A.M. 1968. *La Lesbo di Longo Sofista*, Palermo.
- Scarcella, A.M. 1971. "La tecnica dell'imitazione in Longo Sofista", *GIF* 23, 34–59.
- Scarpi, P. 1976. *Lecture sulla religione classica: L'inno omerico a Demeter*, Florence.
- Schama, S. 1995. *Landscape and Memory*, London.

- Schetter, W. 1973. "Nemesians Bukolika und die Anfänge der spätlateinischen Dichtung", in *Studien zur Literatur der Spätantike, W. Schmid zum 25. Jahrestag seiner Lehre in Bonn*, Bonn, 1–43 (= Id., *Kaiserzeit und Spätantike: Kleine Schriften 1957–1992*, Stuttgart 1994, 141–181).
- Schiesaro, A. 1985. "Il 'locus horridus' nelle *Metamorfosi* di Apuleio", *Maia* 37, 211–223.
- Schiesaro, A. 2003. *The Passions in Play: Thyestes and the Poetics of Senecan Drama*, Cambridge.
- Schissel, O. 1942. *Der byzantinische Garten: Seine Darstellung im gleichzeitigen Romane*, Vienna.
- Schlatter, G. 1941 *Theokrit und Kallimachos*, Diss., Zurich.
- Schmid, W. 1953. "Panegyrik und Bukolik in der neronischen Epoche: Ein Beitrag zur Erklärung der Carmina Einsiedlensia", *Bj* 153, 63–96 (= Id., *Ausgewählte philologische Schriften*, Berlin, 469–493).
- Schmidt, E.A. 1972. *Poetische Reflexion: Vergils Bukolik*, Munich.
- Schmidt, E.A. 1987. *Bukolische Leidenschaft, oder Über antike Hirtenpoesie*, Frankfurt/Main, Bern, and New York.
- Schmidt, E.A. 1998a. Review of Alpers (1996), in *IJCT* 5, 226–251.
- Schmidt, E.A. 1998b. "Freedom and Ownership: A Contribution to the Discussion of Vergil's First *Eclogue*", in *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 10, 185–201.
- Schöffel, C. 2002. *Martial, Buch 8*, Stuttgart.
- Schofield, M. 1999. *The Stoic Idea of the City*, (2nd. ed.) Chicago.
- Schönbeck, G. 1962. *Der Locus Amoenus von Homer bis Horaz*, Heidelberg.
- Schönberger, O. 1989. *Longos: Hirtengeschichten von Daphnis und Chloe*, (4th ed.) Berlin.
- Schröder, B. 1991. *Carmina non quae nemorale resultent: Ein Kommentar zur 4. Ekloge des Calpurnius Siculus*, Frankfurt/Main, Bern, and New York.
- Schröder, B.-J. 1999. *Titel und Text: Zur Entwicklung lateinischer Gedichtüberschriften. Mit Untersuchungen zu lateinischen Buchtiteln, Inhaltsverzeichnissen und anderen Gliederungsmitteln*, Berlin and New York.
- Schütrumpf, E. 2001. "Dikaiarch's Βίος Ἑλλάδος und die Philosophie des vierten Jahrhunderts", in Fortenbaugh and Schütrumpf (eds.), 255–277.
- Seaford, R. 1984. *Euripides. Cyclops*, Oxford.
- Segal, C. 1965. "Tamen cantabitis Arcades—Exile and Arcadia in *Eclogues* One and Nine", *Arion* 4, 237–266 (= Segal (1981) 270–300; = Hardie (ed.) (1999) vol. 1, 172–202).
- Segal, C. 1969. *Landscape in Ovid's Metamorphoses: A Study in the Transformation of a Literary Symbol*, Wiesbaden.
- Segal, C. 1972. "Theocritean Criticism and the Interpretation of the Fourth Idyll", *Ramus* 1, 1–25 (= Segal (1981) 85–109).
- Segal, C. 1974a. "'Since Daphnis Dies': The Meaning of Theocritus' First Idyll", *MH* 31, 1–22 (= Segal (1981) 25–46).
- Segal, C. 1974b. "Simichidas' Modesty", *AJPh* 95, 128–136 (= Segal (1981) 167–175).
- Segal, C. 1981. *Poetry and Myth in Ancient Pastoral: Essays on Theocritus and Virgil*, Princeton.

- Segal, C. 1982. *Dionysiac Poetics and Euripides' Bacchae*, Princeton.
- Segal, C. 1984. "Underreading and Intertextuality: Sappho, Simaetha, and Odysseus in Theocritus' Second Idyll", *Arethusa* 17, 201–209.
- Segal, C. 1986. *Language and Desire in Seneca's Phaedra*, Princeton.
- Selden, D. 1994. "Genre of Genre", in Tatum (ed.), 39–64.
- Seng, H. 1999. *Vergils Eklogenbuch. Aufbau, Chronologie und Zahlenverhältnisse*, Hildesheim, Zurich and New York.
- Sens, A. 1997. *Theocritus. Dioscuri (Idyll 22)*, Göttingen.
- Sens, A. 2003. "Pleasures Recalled: A.R. 3.813–814, Asclepiades, and Homer", *HSPH* 101, 303–309.
- Serrao, G. 1971. *Problemi di poesia alessandrina. I. Studi su Teocrito*, Rome.
- Serrao, G. 1975. "L'idillio V di Teocrito: realtà campestre e stilizzazione letteraria", *QUCC* 19, 73–109.
- Serrao, G. 1977a. "La poesia bucolica: realtà campestre e stilizzazione letteraria", in R. Bianchi Bandinelli (ed.), *Storia e civiltà dei Greci*, vol. 9, Milan, 180–199.
- Serrao, G. 1977b. "La poetica del "nuovo stile": dalla mimesi aristotelica alla poetica della verità", in R. Bianchi Bandinelli (ed.), *Storia e civiltà dei Greci*, vol. 9, Milan, 200–253.
- Serrao, G. 1984. "Amarillide", in *Enciclopedia virgiliana*, vol. 1, 122–123.
- Settis, S. 1999. *Laocoonte: Fama e stile*, Rome.
- Sharrock, A. 1994. *Seduction and Repetition in Ovid's Ars amatoria 2*, New York.
- Sharrock, A. 2000. "Intratextuality: Texts, Parts, and (W)holes in Theory", in Sharrock and Morales (eds.), 1–39.
- Sharrock, A. and Morales, H. (eds.) 2000. *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman Textual Relations*, Oxford.
- Shaw, B. 1982/83. "«Eaters of Flesh, Drinkers of Milk»: The Ancient Mediterranean Ideology of the Pastoral Nomad", *AncSoc* 13/14, 5–31 (= chap. VI in Id., *Rulers, Nomads, and Christians in Roman North Africa*, Aldershot 1995).
- Sherwin-White, S. 1978. *Ancient Cos. A Historical Study from the Dorian Settlement to the Imperial Period*, Göttingen.
- Shorrock, R. 2001. *The Challenge of Epic. Allusive Engagement in the Dionysiaca of Nonnus*, Leiden.
- Sider, D. 2001. "Theocritus 27. Oaristys", *WJA* 25, 99–105.
- Simeonova, L. 2000. "Foreigners in Tenth-Century Byzantium: A Contribution to the History of Cultural Encounter", in D.C. Smythe (ed.), *Strangers to Themselves: The Byzantine Outsider (Papers from the Thirty-second Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton, March 1998)*, Aldershot, 229–244.
- Skemp, J.B. 1952. *Plato's Statesman*, London.
- Skinner, M.B. 2001. "Ladies' Day at the Art Institute: Theocritus, Herodas, and the Gendered Gaze", in A. Lardinois and L. McClure (eds.), *Making Silence Speak: Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society*, Princeton, 201–222.
- Skutsch, F. 1901. *Aus Vergils Frühzeit*. Leipzig.
- Skutsch, O. 1969. "Symmetry and Sense in the *Eclogues*", *HSPH* 73, 153–169.

- Skydsgaard, J.E. 1988. "Transhumance in Ancient Greece", in Whittaker (ed.), 75–86.
- Slater, N.W. 1994. "Calpurnius and the Anxiety of Vergilian Influence: *Eclogue I*", *SyllClass* 5, 71–78.
- Slings, S.R. 1991. "The Quiet Life in Euripides' *Antiope*", in A. Harder and H. Hofmann (eds.), *Fragmenta dramatica: Beiträge zur Interpretation der griechischen Tragikerfragmente und ihrer Wirkungsgeschichte*, Göttingen, 137–151.
- Smith, B.H. 1968. *Poetic Closure: A Study of How Poems End*, Chicago.
- Smith, K.F. 1913. *The Elegies of Albius Tibullus*, New York.
- Smith, O.L. 1996. "Medieval and Renaissance Commentaries in Greek on Classical Greek Texts", *C&M* 47, 391–405.
- Smith, R.R.R. 1991. *Hellenistic Sculpture: A Handbook*, London.
- Snell, B. 1953. *The Discovery of the Mind: The Greek Origins of European Thought*, (Engl. trans.; Hamburg 1946) Oxford.
- Snell, B. 1964. *Scenes from Greek Drama*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- Solodow, J.B. 1977. "Poeta impotens: The Last Three *Eclogues*", *Latomus* 36, 757–771.
- Solodow, J.B. 1986. "*Raucae, tua cura, palumbes*: Study of a Poetic Word Order", *HSPH* 90, 129–153.
- Solodow, J.B. 1988. *The World of Ovid's Metamorphoses*, Chapel Hill.
- Sonnino, M. 2003. "Insulto scommatico e teoria del comico in un simposio alessandrino del 203 a.C. (Polibio 15.25.31–33)", in R. Nicolai (ed.), *ΠΥΣΜΟΣ: Studi di poesia metrica e musica greca offerti dagli allievi a Luigi Enrico Rossi per i suoi settant'anni*, Rome, 283–301.
- Soubiran, J. 1972. "Une lecture des *Bucoliques* de Virgile", *Pallas* 19, 41–75.
- Spadaro, M.D. 1969. *Sulle egloghe politiche di Tito Calpurnio Siculo*, Catania.
- Spanoudakis, K. 2002. *Philias of Cos*, Leiden.
- Stanzel, K.-H. 1989. "Bukolische Dreiecksverhältnisse: Zu Calpurnius' und Nemesians zweiter Ekloge", *WJA* 15, 183–201.
- Stanzel, K.-H. 1995. *Liebende Hirten: Theokrits Bukolik und die alexandrinische Poesie*, Stuttgart and Leipzig.
- Stanzel, K.-H. 1996. "Selbstzitate in den mimischen Gedichten Theokrits", in Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (eds.), 205–225.
- Stanzel, K.-H. 1998. "Mimen, Mimepen und Mimiamben—Theokrit, Herodas und die Kreuzung der Gattungen", in Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (eds.), 143–165.
- Stark, I. 1989. Religiöse Elemente im antiken Roman, in H. Kuch (ed.), *Der antike Roman. Untersuchungen zur literarischen Kommunikation und Gattungsgeschichte*, Berlin, 135–149.
- Starr, R.J. 1994. "Did Alfenus Varus Campaign in Germany?", *Historia* 43, 249–252.
- Starr, R.J. 1995. "Vergil's Seventh *Eclogue* and Its Readers: Biographical Allegory as an Interpretative Strategy in Antiquity and Late Antiquity", *CPh* 90, 129–138.
- Steinmetz, P. (ed.) 1990. *Beiträge zur hellenistischen Literatur und ihrer Rezeption in Rom*, Stuttgart.
- Stephens, S.A. 2003. *Seeing Double. Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.

- Stephens, S.A. 2004. "Posidippus's Poetry Book: Where Macedon Meets Egypt", in W. Harris and G. Ruffini (eds.), *Ancient Alexandria Between Egypt and Greece*, Leiden, 63–87.
- Stephens, S.A. 2005. "Battle of the Books", in Gutzwiller (ed.), 229–248.
- Strano, M. 1975/76. "Considerazioni sull' idillio X di Teocrito", *Helikon* 15/16, 454–460.
- Strzygowski, J. 1888. "Die Monatscyclen der byzantinischen Kunst", *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* 11, 23–46.
- Sturm, J. 1901. "Ein unbekanntes griechisches Idyll aus der Mitte des XV. Jahrhunderts", *ByzZ* 10, 433–452.
- Sullivan, J.P. 1985. *Literature and Politics in the Age of Nero*, Ithaca NY.
- Swain, S. (ed.) 1999. *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*, Oxford.
- Swain, S. 1991. "Arrian the Epic Poet", *JHS* 111, 211–214.
- Swain, S. 1996. *Hellenism and Empire*, Oxford.
- Syme, R. 1979–1991. *Roman Papers*, Oxford.
- Tarrant, R.J. 1978. "The Addressee of Virgil's Eighth Eclogue", *HSPH* 82, 197–199.
- Tatum, J. (ed.) 1994. *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, Baltimore and London.
- Teske, D. 1991. *Der Roman des Longos als Werk der Kunst. Untersuchungen zum Verhältnis von Physis und Techne in Daphnis und Chloe*, Münster.
- Theodorakopoulos, E. 1997. "Closure: The Book of Virgil", in Martindale (ed.), 155–165.
- Thilo, G. and Hagen, H. 1881–1902. *Servii grammatici qui feruntur in Vergiliū carmina commentariū*, Leipzig.
- Thomas, R.F. 1983. "Callimachus, the *Victoria Berenices*, and Roman Poetry", *CQ* 33, 92–113 (= Thomas (1999) 68–100).
- Thomas, R.F. 1985. "From *Recusatio* to Commitment: The Evolution of the Vergilian Programme", *PLLS* 5, 61–73 (= Thomas (1999) 101–113).
- Thomas, R.F. 1986. "Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference", *HSPH* 90, 171–198 (= Thomas (1999) 114–141).
- Thomas, R.F. 1992. "The Old Man Revisited: Memory, Reference and Genre in Virg., *Georg.* 4, 116–148", *MD* 29, 35–70 (= Thomas (1999) 173–205).
- Thomas, R.F. 1996. "Genre Through Intertextuality: Theocritus to Virgil and Propertius", in Harder Regtuit, and Wakker (eds.), 227–246 (= Thomas (1999) 246–266).
- Thomas, R.F. 1998. "Voice, Poetics and Virgil's Sixth *Eclogue*", in J. Jasanoff, H.C. Melchert, and L. Oliver (eds.), *Mir Curad: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, Innsbruck, 669–676 (= Thomas (1999) 288–296).
- Thomas, R.F. 1999. *Reading Virgil and His Texts. Studies in Intertextuality*, Ann Arbor.
- Thomas, R.F. 2001. *Virgil and the Augustan Reception*, Cambridge.
- Thompson, D.J. 2005. "Posidippus, Poet of the Ptolemies", in Gutzwiller (ed.), 269–286.
- Todorov, T. 1976. "The Origin of Genres", *New Literary History* 8, 159–170.
- Toner, J.P. 1995. *Leisure and Ancient Rome*, Cambridge.
- Townend, G.B. 1980. "Calpurnius Siculus and the *Munus Neronis*", *JRS* 70, 166–174.

- Toynbee, J.M.C. 1973. *Animals in Roman Life and Art*, Ithaca NY.
- Traina, A. 1965. "Si numquam fallit imago. Riflessioni sulle *Bucoliche* e l'epicureismo", *A&R* 10, 72–78 (= *Poeti latini (e neolatini): note e saggi filologici*, (2nd ed.) Bologna 1986, 163–174; Engl. trans. in Hardie (ed.) (1999) vol. 1, 84–90).
- Trapp, M.B. 1990. "Plato's *Phaedrus* in Second-Century Greek Literature", in D.A. Russell (ed.), *Antonine Literature*, Oxford, 141–173.
- Treadgold, W.T. 1980. *The Nature of the Bibliotheca of Photius*, Washington DC.
- Trovati, G. 2001. "Gli ultimi sviluppi della poesia bucolica greca", *Acme* 54, 35–72.
- Valckenaer, L.C. 1779. *Theocriti, Bionis, et Moschi carmina bucolica*, Leiden.
- Valley, G. 1926. *Über den Sprachgebrauch des Longos*, Diss. Uppsala.
- Valpuesta Bermúdez, M. 1990. *Estudio sobre la obra literaria de Bión de Esmirna*, Diss. Seville.
- Van Groningen, B.A. 1958–1959. "Quelques problèmes de la poésie bucolique grecque", *Mnemosyne* 11, 293–317 and 12, 24–53.
- Van Sickle, J. 1975. "Epic and Bucolic (Theocritus, Id. VII; Virgil, Ecl. I)", *QUCC* 19, 45–72.
- Van Sickle, J. 1976. "Theocritus and the Development of the Conception of Bucolic Genre", *Ramus* 5, 18–44.
- Van Sickle, J. 1978. *The Design of Virgil's Bucolics*, Rome (reprint with a new introduction: London 2004).
- Van Sickle, J. 1980a. "The Book-Roll and Some Conventions of the Poetic Book", *Arethusa* 13, 5–42.
- Van Sickle, J. 1980b. "Reading Virgil's Eclogue Book", *ANRW* 2.31.1, 576–603.
- Van Sickle, J. 1981. "Commentaria in Maronem commenticia: A Case History of *Bucolics* Misread", *Arethusa* 14, 17–34.
- Van Sickle, J. 1984a. "Dawn and Dusk as Motifs of Opening or Closure in Heroic and Bucolic Epos (Homer, Apollonius, Theocritus, Virgil)", in *Atti del convegno di studi virgiliani*, vol. 1, Milan, 124–147.
- Van Sickle, J. 1984b. "How Do We Read Ancient Texts? Codes & Critics in Virgil, Eclogue One", *MD* 13, 107–128.
- Van Sickle, J. 1984c. "Bucoliche: La Struttura", in *Enciclopedia virgiliana*, vol. 1, 549–552.
- Van Sickle, J. 1995. "Review Article: The End of the *Eclogues*", *Vergilius* 41, 114–133.
- Van Sickle, J. 2000. "Virgil vs. Cicero, Lucretius, Theocritus, Plato, and Homer: Two Programmatic Plots in the First Bucolic", *Vergilius* 46, 21–58.
- Varner, E.R. 2000. "Grotesque Vision: Seneca's Tragedies and Neronian Art", in G.W.M. Harrison (ed.), *Seneca in Performance*, London and Swansea, 119–136.
- Vaughn, J.W. 1981. "Theocritus Vergilianus and Liber Bucolicon", *Aevum* 55, 47–68.
- Verdière, R. 1954. *T. Calpurnii Siculi De laude Pisonis et Bucolica*, Berchem and Brussels.
- Verdière, R. 1966. "La bucolique post-virgilienne", *Eos* 56, 161–185.
- Verdière, R. 1977. "Qui est le Mélébée des *Bucoliques* de Calpurnius?", *RPh* 51, 15–21.

- Verdière, R. 1985. "Le genre bucolique à l'époque de Néron: les *Bucolica* de T. Calpurnius Siculus et les *Carmina Einsiedlensia*: État de la question et perspectives", *ANRW* 2.32.3, 1845–1924.
- Verity, A. 2002. *Theocritus*. Idylls, Oxford.
- Vetta, M. (ed.) 1983. *Poesia e simposio nella Grecia antica*, Rome and Bari.
- Vetta, M. 1992. *Il simposio: la monodia e il giambo*, in G. Cambiano, L. Canfora, and D. Lanza (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*, vol. I.1, Rome, 177–218.
- Vian, F. 1959. *Recherches sur les Posthomericæ de Quintus de Smyrna*, Paris.
- Vian, F. 1976. *Nonnos de Panopolis. Les Dionysiaques. Tome I. Chants I–II*, Paris.
- Vian, F. 1990. *Nonnos de Panopolis. Les Dionysiaques. Tome IX. Chants XXV–XXIX*, Paris.
- Vian, F. 2003. *Nonnos de Panopolis. Les Dionysiaques. Tome XVIII. Chant XLVIII*, Paris.
- Viellefond, J.-R. 1987. *Longus, Pastorales (Daphnis et Chloé)*, Paris.
- Vinchesi, M.A. 1991. "La terza ecloga di Calpurnio Siculo fra tradizione bucolica e tradizione elegiaca", *Prometheus* 17, 259–276.
- Vinchesi, M.A. 1996. *Calpurnio Siculo. Egloghe*, Milan.
- Volpilhac, P. 1987. "Nemesiano", in *Enciclopedia virgiliana*, vol. 3, 689–690.
- Vornefeld, W. 1901. *De scriptorum Latinorum locis a Plutarcho citatis*, Diss. Münster.
- Vox, O. 1997. *Carmi di Teocrito e dei bucolici greci minori*, Turin.
- Vozza, P. 1993. "L'ars poetica di Calpurnio-Coridone ed il giudizio sull'età neroniana", *BStudLat* 23, 282–308.
- Vozza, P. 1994. "Un silenzio eloquente (Quid tacitus ...? Calpurnio ecl. 4.1–4)", *BStudLat* 24, 71–92.
- Walsh, G.B. 1985. "Seeing and Feeling: Representation in Two Poems of Theocritus", *CPh* 80, 1–19.
- Walter, H. 1988. *Studien zur Hirtendichtung Nemesians*, Wiesbaden.
- Waterfield, R. 1997. *Xenophon. Hiero the Tyrant and Other Treatises*, London.
- Watson, L. 1991. *Arae: The Curse Poetry of Antiquity*, Leeds.
- Weber, G. 1993. *Dichtung und höfische Gesellschaft: Die Rezeption von Zeitgeschichte am Hof der ersten drei Ptolemäer*, Stuttgart.
- Webster, T.B.L. 1967. *The Tragedies of Euripides*, London.
- Webster, T.B.L. 1970. *Studies in Later Greek Comedy*, (2nd ed.) New York.
- Weitzmann, K. 1951. *Greek Mythology in Byzantine Art*, Princeton.
- Wendel, C. 1901. *De nominibus bucolicis*, (*Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* Suppl. 26) Leipzig.
- Wendel, C. 1914. *Scholia in Theocritum vetera*, Leipzig.
- Wendel, C. 1920. *Überlieferung und Entstehung der Theokrit-Scholien*, (*Abhandlungen der königl. Gesellschaft der Wiss. zu Göttingen* 17.2) Berlin.
- Wernicke, K. 1902. "Pan", in *Ausführl. Lex. Mythologie*, vol. 3, 1347–1481.
- West, M.L. 1966. *Hesiod. Theogony*, Oxford.
- West, M.L. 1970. "Melica", *CQ* 20, 205–215.
- West, M.L. 1992. *Ancient Greek Music*, Oxford.
- West, M.L. 1997. "When Is a Harp a Panpipe? The Meanings of πᾶπις", *CQ* 47, 48–55.
- Whitby, M. 1994. "From Moschus to Nonnus: The Evolution of the Nonnian

- Style", in Hopkinson (ed.), 99–155.
- White, H. 1979. *Studies in Theocritus and Other Hellenistic Poets*, Amsterdam.
- White, P. 1993. *Promised Verse. Poets in the Society of Augustan Rome*, Cambridge MA and London.
- Whitehorne, J. 1995. "Women's Work in Theocritus, Idyll 15", *Hermes* 123, 63–75.
- Whittaker, C.R. 1988. *Pastoral Economies in Classical Antiquity*, (PCPhS Suppl. 14) Cambridge.
- Wigtil, D.N. 1981. "Toward a Date for the Greek Fourth Eclogue", *CJ* 76, 336–341.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1906. *Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Bukoliker*, Berlin.
- Williams, Gordon. 1968. *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*, Oxford.
- Williams, F. 1971. "A Theophany in Theocritus", *CQ* 21, 137–145 (= Effe (ed.) (1986), 272–285).
- Williams, Gordon. 1978. *Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the Early Empire*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- Williams, Gordon. 1992. "Theocritus' Idyll 7 from a Virgilian Perspective", in R. Hexter and D. Selden (eds.), *Innovations of Antiquity*, New York, 541–556.
- Williams, Gareth. 2002. "Ovid's Exile poetry: *Tristia*, *Epistulae ex Ponto* and *Ibis*", in Hardie (ed.), 233–245.
- Willink, C. 1986. *Euripides. Orestes*, Oxford.
- Wills, J. 1993. "Vergil's *cuium pecus*", *Vergilius* 39, 3–11.
- Wills, J. 1996. *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion*, Oxford.
- Wilson, N.G. 1983. *Scholars of Byzantium*, London.
- Wilson, N.G. 1994. *Photius. The Bibliotheca: A Selection Translated with Notes*, London.
- Wimmel, W. 1960. *Kallimachos in Rom. Die Nachfolge seines apologetischen Dichtens in der Augusteerzeit*, Wiesbaden.
- Wimmel, W. 1987. *Collectanea*, Stuttgart.
- Winkler, J.J. 1990. *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece*, London.
- Winkler, M.M. 2002. "Chronotope and *locus amoenus* in *Daphnis and Chloe* and *Pleasantville*", in Paschalis and Frangoulidis (eds.), 27–39.
- Wiseman, T.P. 1982. "Calpurnius Siculus and the Claudian Civil War", *JRS* 72, 68–82.
- Wojaczek, G. 1969. *Daphnis: Untersuchungen zur griechischen Bukolik*, Meisenheim/Glan.
- Wright, J. 1983. "Virgil's Pastoral Programme: Theocritus, Callimachus and Eclogue 1", *PCPhS* 29, 107–160 (= Hardie (1999) (ed.) vol. 1, 116–171).
- Wright, M.R. 1981. *Empedocles. The Extant Fragments*, New Haven.
- Wünsch, R. 1900. "Neue Fluchtafeln", *RhM* 55, 73–85.
- Zanker, G. 1987. *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry: A Literature and its Audience*, London.
- Zanker, G. 2004. *Modes of Viewing in Hellenistic Poetry and Art*, Madison.
- Zeitlin, F.I. 1990. "The Poetics of *Erôs*: Nature, Art and Imitation in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*", in D.M. Halperin, J.J. Winkler, and F.I. Zeitlin (eds.),

- Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*, Princeton, 417–464.
- Zeitlin, F.I. 1994. "Gardens of Desire in Longus's *Daphnis and Chloe*: Nature, Art, and Imitation", in Tatum (ed.), 148–170.
- Zetzel, J.E.G. 1980 "Horace's *Liber Sermonum*: The Structure of Ambiguity", *Arethusa* 13, 59–77.
- Zetzel, J.E.G. 1984. "Servius and Triumviral History in the *Eclogues*", *CPh* 79, 139–142.
- Zimmerman, C. 1994. *The Pastoral Narcissus: A Study of the First Idyll of Theocritus*, London.
- Zimmermann, B. 1994. "Liebe und poetische Reflexion. Der Hirtenroman des Longos", *Prometheus* 20, 193–210.

GENERAL INDEX

(*Indexes compiled by Maria Noussia.*)

- Achilles, 5, 171, 191, 209, 218, 229,
231, 232, 331, 433, 521
Achilles' shield, 4, 12, 214
Achilles Tatius, 551, 553–554, 560,
577 n. 96
Acis, 406, 409–410, 419 n. 30, 421,
422, 425
Actaeon, 440, 441, 523–530 *passim*
Adonis, 42, 44, 71, 111, 112, 119, 122,
124, 126, 130–137 *passim*, 140, 142,
173, 196, 197, 220–223, 232–233,
527
adynata, 197 n. 134, 327–329, 561,
562, 563, 564
Aegon, 10, 99–102, 255
Aeolic:
hexameter, 27 n. 5
pentameter, 27 n. 5
poems, 25, 36 and n. 39, 39
poetry/poets, 25, 28, 36–39
tetrameter, 27 n. 5
Aeschinas, 67–69, 108–110, 566
Aetna, 408 n. 11, 418, 421–422
Agamemnon, 5, 8, 136
Agathias, 550
Agathon, 49 and n. 84, 574 n. 85
Ageanax, 11, 22, 36, 38, 61, 64, 66,
133
Agele, 492
Agis, 69, 70, 110
Agroco, 48 n. 78
Alcaeus, 25 and n. 1, 26–27, 36–39,
44, 266, 403
Alexander the Great, 8–9, 91, 96,
114 n. 96, 332 n. 110
Alexandria, 93, 97, 102, 111, 121, 124,
141–146 *passim*
Alexis, 21, 105, 199, 303 n. 7, 305
n. 14, 365, 382–384, 400–401,
500, 504, 506
Alfenus Varus:
in Donatus, 302–303
in Virgil, 319, 321–322, 364
Alfius, 174 n. 31, 452
Aline, 147–148
allegorical interpretation, 15, 199,
218, 226, 253 n. 43, 271–272, 291,
305 n. 14, 307–310, 321–322, 326,
340, 377 n. 22, 471, 486–487, 492,
495, 497, 501, 576–577
Donatus on, 304
Servius on, 253 n. 43, 304–305,
308, 310, 326, 502 n. 11
Alphesiboeus, 469
Alpus, 538
Amaryllis, 44, 71, 185, 192, 254, 257,
278, 284, 285, 291, 310, 323, 365,
369, 379–388 *passim*, 392, 401,
469, 483, 484, 487, 489, 490, 492,
493, 494 n. 44, 506
amoebean: see “bucolic song”
Ampeloi, 480 n. 4
Ampelus, 523–529 *passim*
Amphion, 15–19 *passim*
amulets, magical, 76–78
Amycus, 97, 98, 100
Amyntas, 40 n. 50, 184, 305 n. 14,
326 n. 88, 401, 503
Anacreon, 25 n. 3, 32 n. 20, 39, 41
and n. 55, 44 and n. 68, 45 n. 71,
46, 47, 72
Anacreontea, 41, 201, 219, 226, 237,
550, 562, 564
analogy, 2, 6, 8, 9, 17, 179–180
Anchises, 131, 132, 245
Antigonus Gonatas, 105
Antigonus Monophthalmus, 105
Antimachus of Colophon, 163, 533
Antony (Mark), 329, 347
Anyte, 150 and n. 10, 154–162 *passim*

- and Nicias, chronology of, 155–158
 and Apollonius, chronology of, 159–162
 Aphrodite, 13, 41, 52 n. 92, 83, 86, 112, 130, 131, 132, 135, 136, 144, 162, 163, 188, 189, 190, 220, 221, 223, 227, 232, 233, 244, 245, 496, 528, 532, 542, 543, 544, 546, 562, 563, 564
 Apollo, 3 n. 5, 13, 14, 95–96, 106, 188 n. 94, 195 n. 124, 221, 227, 270–271, 272, 273 n. 33, 286 n. 24, 287, 309 and n. 31, 318, 320, 343, 359, 386 n. 41, 406, 407 n. 8, 413–415, 502 n. 11, 521, 530, 532, 535, 536, 539
 Apollonius Rhodius, 15, 19 n. 37, 87, 90, 97, 159–161, 221, 331, 403, 533 and Anyte, see “Anyte and Apollonius”
 Apollonius of Tyana, 511 n. 38
 Appian, 508 and n. 24
 Arachne, 414
 Aratus (character of Theocritus), 11, 22, 35, 42–43, 50 n. 86, 61, 62, 66, 177, 244, 256, 309 n. 31, 483
 Aratus (the poet), 3 n. 5, 35 and n. 32, 42, 43, 106 n. 79 (on the identification with Aratus, the character of Theocritus), 356, 403 *Hymn to Pan*, 106
 Arcadia, IX, 360, 408, 460, 469, 476, 511 n. 35
 Archilochus, 13, 39, 41, 44, 266
 Arethusa, 168, 205, 218, 226, 328, 344, 360
 Argonauts, 15, 96, 98, 159, 161
 Argus, 16, 405–406, 411–413, 518 n. 11
 Aristarchus, 210, 246
 Aristaeus, 524
 Aristis, 62
 Aristophanes, 20, 81, 82, 105 n. 73, 125
 ancient exegesis of Aristophanes and comic texts, 259–260
 Arrian (epic poet), 510
 Arsinoe II, 91, 96 n. 34, 102, 111–112, 135
 art *vs* nature, VII, IX, 137, 148, 157, 197, 203–204, 265, 268, 410, 440, 494 and n. 44, 543
 Artemis, 9, 239, 525
 Artemidorus of Tarsus, 167 n. 1, 223, 251 n.
 Asclepiades (epigrammatist), 11, 28 n. 9, 45 n. 70, 110 n. 90, 223, 322
 Asclepiades of Myrlea, 238
 Asclepius, 122, 124 and n. 71, 125
 Asinius Pollio:
 in Donatus, 302–303
 in Virgil, 298, 311–314, 316–317, 322, 328–329, 343, 386 n. 41, 458
 Astacus, 472, 473
 Astylus, 492
 Augustus: see “Octavian”
 Aura, 535–536
aulos, 9, 251 n. 37, 326, 414, 518–519, 523–524, 529, 531, 535–539 *passim*
auxesis, 416–423
 Bacchae/Bacchantes/Bacchic/(Euripides’) *Bacchae*, 294, 427, 433, 442, 443, 446 (see also “Bacchic poetics”)
 Bacchic poetics, 439–449 *passim*, 523–525, 536–540
barbarus, 267–268
 Barbiton, 559–560
 Barzon, 558–559
 Battus/Battiadae, 99, 102, 103, 192, 193, 254–256, 257
 Berenice I, 110, 112, 115, 136
 Berenice (I?, Syra?), 91–92
 bilingualism in the imperial age, 490–491, 508–512
 Bilistiche, 110
 Bion of Smyrna, 167–207, 209, 216–220, 222–234 *passim*, 243, 266, 499–500, 526–527, 550, 552
Epitaph for Adonis, 135 n. 49, 168 n. 5, 170 n. 13, 173 n. 25, 176,

- 178, 195, 220, 221, 222, 527,
532–534
[*Epithalamios for Achilles and
Deidameia*], 171, 191, 209,
218, 229
Bombyca, 32, 50–51, 55, 507
books, poetic, 333–336, 341, 354–
355, 355 n. 77, 356 and n. 81,
456–457
boukolikos/boukoliasdomai, 211, 241
n. 18
Branchus, 13
Brennus, 106
Brongus, 536–537, 540, 544
Bucaeus, 31–33, 50–52, 55–56, 182,
251, 255–256
bucolic poetry:
and allegory: see “allegorical
interpretation”
and Byzantine mime, 549–550
and Byzantine novel, 549–579
passim
and dialects, 80–81, 111 n. 91,
138–139, 142, 167–168,
210, 213–214, 216, 218,
264
and dialogue, 173–186, 217
and Dio of Prusa, *Euboicus*, 480,
499 n. 3
and elegy, Roman, 176, 201, 207,
362, 400–402, 418–419, 438,
453, 467, 468, 566
and emotions, 188–201
and Epicurus/Epicureanism, 15,
275–300 *passim*, 306, 499 n. 3
and epigram, 61, 63, 147–167
passim, 178–179, 341, 361–362
and eros: see “Eros/eros”
and etymological wordplay,
249–250
and georgic themes, 424–425,
474–475
and Golden Age, 244, 278–279,
296–299, 328–332, 436, 438–
439, 453, 454, 457, 464, 469,
524, 559
and Lucretius, 244, 264, 275–300
passim, 306, 372 and n. 11, 373
n.15, 377 n. 22, 467
and lyric/elegiac poetry/meters,
25–52 *passim*, 55–56, 61, 63,
172, 178–179, 213
and magic, 75–90 *passim*
and monologue, 121, 173–186
passim, 195–197, 211, 212, 217,
218, 219, 230, 382, 390–391,
457, 471, 484–485
and narrative technique, 120–121,
173–186, 354–366 *passim*
and nature/landscape, 67, 70–71,
95–104 *passim*, 117–117, 150–157
passim, 162, 181–184, 195–198,
203–204, 244–245, 256–
257, 286–287, 306, 408–409,
412–413, 421–423, 431–438,
440–449 *passim*, 460–461, 500,
566–570 *passim*
and novel: see “Longus the
Sophist” and 480 n. 4
and praise/patronage, 91–119
passim, 301, 306–332 *passim*,
457–459, 464
and pantomime, 419 n. 30
and philosophy, 6–8, 48–49, 244,
275–300, 416 n. 26, 438
and “realism” *vs* fictionalization,
123–124, 180–186 *passim*, 240–
244
and satyr play, 419 n. 30, 479–480
and sex, 162, 181, 192–193, 245,
256–261, 504 n. 14
and technology, 544–545
apprenticeship in, 60–61
as “representative anecdote”,
VII, 129
children in, 185–186, 194, 282–
288, 295–296, 329–331
definition of, VII–XIII, 127–128
(see also “pastoral”)
generic ascent, origins, and
history of, 1–2, 9, 53, 54–55,
57–73 *passim*, 82, 129–130, 178–
179, 186 and n. 85, 201–205,
238–242, 263–273 *passim*, 278–

- 300 *passim*, 374 n. 17, 403–411,
479–497, 486–493
naivety in, IX–X, 123, 127, 132,
137, 139–140 n. 61, 165, 194
n. 120, 283, 335, 336, 367, 410,
420, 471, 499 n. 3, 524–525,
540, 542–543
old women in, 48
Romanisation of, 263–273 *passim*,
285, 394–395, 403–425, 423–
425
vs epic, 90, 97, 190, 205, 273, 278,
319, 323, 334–335, 354, 360–
361, 404–405, 411, 418–419,
421–422, 517, 533
bucolic song, 9, 11, 15, 18, 19, 22,
28–44 *passim*, 53–62 *passim*, 75–
76, 79, 81–82, 85, 87 n. 38, 89,
104, 114, 125–126 and n. 20,
133, 134, 137, 165, 178–179, 186,
191–192, 194–195, 197–201, 205
n. 177, 214–215, 218, 221–222,
226–229, 231, 233, 237–239,
256–257, 286–292, 309–310,
320–327, 348–352, 362–365, 381–
400 *passim*, 411–423 *passim*, 468,
472, 482–484, 488–489, 506–
507, 520–523, 533–535, 552–553,
559–560
and *hasychia/otium*, 270, 290,
376–379, 382, 394, 412–413,
425
and lament, 31, 122, 131, 132, 192,
196–197, 221–222, 257, 385,
399, 424 n. 45, 461, 485 n. 18,
525–529, 530–535, 545–547
and singing exchange/contest, or
amoebean form, 11, 22, 35 and
n. 31, 40, 54, 57–58 & 60–61
("cut and thrust exchange"),
104, 137–140, 174, 180, 217, 241
and n. 18, 325, 348–352, 382
and n. 82, 414–416, 420–421,
488, 522–523, 541–542, 559
with n. 40
and symposium, see "symposi-
um/sympotic motifs"
and the music of cicadas/crickets,
3, 66, 114, 191, 197, 199, 205
n. 177, 248–249, 413 n. 20, 574
and the music of reeds, 408–410,
518–520, 539
as a cure for love, 21–22, 75–90
passim, 108, 192–193, 198–201,
214, 228–233, 260, 390–393,
482–485, 520, 523 and n. 25,
534–535, 564–565
metre of, 55–56, 61, 172, 178–179,
210–211, 213, 215–216, 256 (see
also "Theocritus, hexametrical
versification in")
music of, 14–16, 22, 56, 76, 165,
202, 211, 214–215, 242, 280–
281, 284, 289, 298 n. 54, 306,
308, 405 n. 6, 407–420 *passim*,
518–521, 523–524, 535, 537–
540
oral character of, 53, 58–61, 65,
70, 264, 336, 348–354 *passim*,
361–362, 367, 396–397
Byzantine Novel, 549–579 *passim*
gardens in, 549, 557, 566, 568,
570–579
Cadmus, 407 n. 9, 415, 517–523
calamus: see "bucolic song and the
music of reeds"
Calamus, 528
Callidemus, 566–568, 570
Callimachus (and Callimacheanism),
3, 13, 22–23 and n. 47, 30 n. 15,
82–85, 90, 93, 95–98, 102–103,
153, 216, 220, 272, 282–283, 285
n. 21, 287–288, 292, 320, 356,
420, 473, 536
Aetia, 78, 81, 97, 98, 100, 102,
318–319, 341
Galatea (?), 106
Hecale, 102, 103, 499 n. 3, 566 and
n. 61
Hymn to Apollo, 153
Hymn to Delos, 95–96, 106
Iambi, 36 n. 37, 44, 408 n. 11
Calpurnius Siculus, 301–302, 331,

- 413–414, 453–463 *passim*, 466,
467–477 *passim*
chronology of: see “Neronian
age”
Ecl. 1, 457, 458, 462, 469
Ecl. 2, 461, 467, 468, 469, 472
Ecl. 3, 461, 467, 468, 469
Ecl. 4, 457, 458–459, 470, 471–472
Ecl. 5, 461, 467, 468, 469, 474–475
Ecl. 6, 461
Ecl. 7, 457, 460, 461, 462, 467,
468, 469, 470, 471–472, 475–
476
Calydna, 30, 93 n. 11
“capping”, 35
Carpus, 528
Castor and Polydeuces: see
“Dioscuri”
Catullus, 186, 210, 221, 282, 296 and
n. 51, 297 n. 52, 329 n. 102, 331
n. 51, 343, 489 n. 27, 509, 524
n. 27
caves, in *loca amoena* and *horrida*,
439–446 *passim*
in Ovid, 440–441, 444–445
in Pomponius Mela, 442–443
in Propertius, 444
and Dionysiac connotations, 443
and the sublime, 445–446
Chalcon, 156
Chamaeleon, 26 n. 3
Charaxus, 37, 38
Charicles, 559–568 *passim*
Charites/Graces, 113, 116, 164, 343,
497
Chariton, 511
Chiron, 67
Chloe, 283 n. 18, 483–513 *passim*,
553, 564, 567, 676
Chromis, 19 n. 39, 30 n. 15, 59, 62,
93, 237, 286
“chthonic” poetry, 427–430
cicadas: see “bucolic song”
Cinna, 322 and n. 71, 509
Circe, 78, 87, 88, 90, 199–201, 434
n. 23, 521, 534
Cissaetha, 245–246, 250
Cleandrus, 567–570
Ceanthes, 199
Cleinias, 561–564, 569–570
Cleon, 151 n. 11, 259
Cleonicus, 68, 69, 110
Cologne epode, 41, 42
Colluthus, 540–547
and Nonnus, 540, 545–547
and Virgil, 544
Comatas, 16, 34, 36 n. 40 n. 51, 43,
57, 64, 65, 71, 130, 133, 134, 181,
189, 202, 242, 248, 252, 255, 258,
264, 381, 522
Cornelius Gallus, 178, 292, 320–321,
362, 402, 453, 459, 476, 500
in Donatus’ interpretation, 302–
303
Corydon, 99, 101–102, 284, 350,
379, 391, 399–400, 458, 460,
461, 463, 469–472, 475, 476, 504,
506
Cos, 93–96, 117, 251, 374
Cotyttaris, 48
Cratinus, 260, 518 n. 9
Creon, 430
crickets: see “bucolic song”
Croesus, 51, 182, 244
Croton, 93, 98, 100–104, 117
cut and thrust exchange: see
“bucolic song”
Cybele, 526
Cyclops, see “Polyphemus”
Cynisca (daughter of Archi-
damus II), 109–111
Cynisca (character of Theocr. 14),
68–70, 102, 109–111, 468
Cynno, 124–125
Cyrene, 93, 102
Cyrus (king), 17 n. 31
Cyrus (Byzantine poet), 550
Damoetas, 9–10, 21, 34 n. 26, 35,
47, 48, 53 n. 1, 54, 56, 58–59, 65,
182 n. 68, 185 n. 80, 191, 252, 254,
289, 316, 335, 350, 383, 391–392,
504, 506
Daphnis, 6, 9–10, 15, 17, 21, 22, 31,

- 34, 35, 41–42 n. 58, 44, 47, 48,
53–54, 56–57 n. 11, 58–60, 64, 65,
71, 100, 112, 130, 131–134, 148,
164, 173, 178, 182, 184, 186–188,
193–194, 203, 213–216, 221–222,
242, 243, 245, 247–248, 252,
264, 271, 286, 292, 305, 325–327,
350, 362, 363, 366, 376–377, 391,
469, 480, 484–513 *passim*, 519,
532, 533, 534, 535, 550, 552, 553,
561–564, 567, 569
- Dels, 95–96
- Delphi, 62, 106
- Delphis, 94, 213, 469, 534
- Demeter, 66, 78–80, 83, 85 and
n. 33, 88, 94, 133, 136 n. 51, 377
n. 21
- dialects: see “bucolic poetry”
- dialogue: see “bucolic poetry”
- Dido, 221, 297 n. 52, 434, 544
- Dio of Prusa: see “bucolic poetry”
- Diomedes, 131–132
- Diomus, 2 n. 3
- Dionysius I, 20, 104, 105, 271
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 508
- Dionysius (Theocritus’ scholiast), 251
- Dionysus, 41 n. 55, 95 n. 29, 96
and n. 35, 102, 112, 116, 273
n. 33, 480 n. 4, 507, 515, 515–540
passim, 552–559, 570, 578 (see also
“Bacchic poetics”)
- Dioscuri, 92, 96–101 *passim*, 112, 213
- Dirae*, pseudovirgilian, 218, 451–452
- divine figures, 13, 32, 38, 180, 253,
270, 273, 285, 290–291, 296, 321,
437, 430, 535 (see also “initiation,
poetic”)
- Domitian, 312–313
- Donace, 465
- Donatus, Aelius:
on praise in Virgil’s *Bucolics*,
302–303 (see also “panegyric”)
on allegory, 304
- donax*: see “bucolic song and the
music of reeds”
- Dorcon, 488, 492, 505, 507
- Doric: see “dialects”
- Dorion, 418
- Drosilla and Charicles*: see Eugenianus
- Drosilla, 561, 564, 566, 567, 568
- Dryas, 480 n. 4, 492
- Echecratides, 42
- Echo/echo, 197 n. 132, 218–219, 231,
284–285, 287, 289, 291, 506, 532,
536, 541
- Egypt, 30 n. 15, 38, 91, 96, 98, 269,
510
- eidyllion*, 354 and n. 72
- Einsiedeln eclogues, 463–464
- ekphrasis*, 123–124, 132–133, 195, 214,
218, 552–557, 571–577, esp. 576
- elegy, Roman: see “bucolic poetry”
- Eleusis, 144
- Empedocles of Acragas, 76, 83–85,
90, 435
- epaoide*, 81–83
- Epicharmus, 2, 107, 123, 217, 236
- Epicurus: see “bucolic poetry”
- epigram: see “bucolic poetry”
- Epimenides, 13
- Epitaph for Bion*, 15 n. 28, 23, 266,
171, 176–177, 178, 179 n. 56, 188,
190, 195–196, 205, 222–225, 266–
267, 307, 318–319, 525, 532–533
- Eros/eros, 39, 41 and n. 55, 47, 48,
49, 85–89, 177 n. 43, 181, 189–
195, 214–215, 217–220, 223, 225–
233 *passim*, 256–261, 482–487,
491–497, 486–497, 494, 528, 562
- Erotes, 40, 43, 44, 135, 163, 488, 511,
534
- Erycius, 488, 511 and n. 35
- eschatology, 466
- Eudromus, 492
- Eugenianus, Nicetas, 549, 557–571,
576–579
and Achilles Tatius, 560
and Callimachus, 566
and Theocritus, 560–570
and Longus, 560, 568–570
- Eumaras, 257–258
- Euphoriion, 533
- Euripides, 4, 14, 16–17, 19, 49, 82,

- 85, 88, 173, 203, 226, 443, 524,
532 n. 55
Europa, 219, 517, 522, 566
Euthycles of Locri, 100 n. 55, 102
Euthynicus, 480 n. 4, 560
- female speech, 28 n. 9, 34 nn. 26 &
27, 52, 121–123; 138–140, 568
Fragmentum Grenfellianum: see
“Grenfell Fragment”
- Galatea, 20–21, 34, 46, 47, 58, 71,
72, 76, 82, 85, 87 n. 37, 104–107,
171, 182, 185 n. 82, 186 n. 86, 188,
191–192, 195–197, 201, 213 n. 19,
228–230, 250, 260, 335, 349, 365,
369, 372 n. 10, 391–392, 406,
416–425 *passim*, 483, 522–523,
567, 570, 575
and Galates (son of Polyphemus
and Galatea), Galatai, 105–106
Gallus: see “Cornelius Gallus”
genres, literary:
and modes of literary presen-
tation (narrative, dramatic,
mixed), 120–122, 354–355
and *polyeideia*, 28–29
system of, and play with conven-
tions of, 93, 151–152, 164–165,
204, 212, 218–218, 224–225,
235–237, 403–405, 413–415,
419 and n. 30, 479–480
Geometres, Ioannes, 550
Gigantomachy, 517–519
Glaucā, 101–102
Glaucōn, 488
Gorgo, 111, 119–146 *passim*
Gnathon, 492, 500
Grenfell Fragment, 34 n. 26
- habrosyne*, 38, 47, 51
Haleis, 40 n. 50
harundo: see “bucolic song and the
music of reeds”
hasychia/otium: see “bucolic song”
Helen, 5, 92, 96–97, 112, 540, 543–
544, 546
- Heliodorus, 551, 558, 567
Heracles, 67, 92, 96, 97, 99, 100, 101,
103, 128, 480
herdsman, 1–23 *passim*, 129–134,
241–244
and peace, 2–10
as seen in Apollonius Rhodius, 15
in Columella, 16
in Euripides, 4–5, 14–15, 17, 19
in Hesiod, 11–14
in Homer, 4–6
in Longus, 10, 16, 17
in Menander, 17
in Ovid, 16, 407 and n. 8
as figure for poet, 306–310, 318–
324, 326–331
as philosopher/poet 10–23 *passim*,
176–178
in philosophers, 6–9
in Aristotle, 7–9
in Dicaearchus, 7
in Plato, 6–7, 14, 18–19
in Zeno, 8–9
in Philoxenus, 20–21
in Sophocles, 17
in Theocritus, 1–2, 9–10, 11,
13–14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21
in Virgil, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21, 23
mythical vs living/ordinary,
186–188, 252–253
‘professional’ requirements/re-
sponsibilities of, 153, 237,
241
Hermes, 16, 18, 87, 148, 155, 336,
407, 410
Hermesianax, 178–179, 194, 213
nn. 18, 19
Hermione, 545, 546
Herodas, 212
Mim. 4, 120–126 *passim*
Hesiod, 1 n. 1, 3, 6, 11–15, 22–23, 57,
62, 79, 143, 177, 180 n. 62, 227,
283–286, 309 n. 30, 403, 486,
547
Hiero I, 113, 115
Hiero II, 2–3, 9, 10, 93, 99, 109,
113–117

- Hippocrates, 84, 94
 Horace, 41, 269, 333, 420, 452, 463, 467
 Epodes, 174 n. 31, 452–453
 Hyacinthus, 195 n. 124, 221, 223
 Hymenaeus, 163, 527–529
Hymn to Demeter, “Homeric”, 78–80
Hymn to Hermes, “Homeric”, 79 n. 17
 Hymnus, 529–536 *passim*, 546
 Hypaepa, 414
Hysmine and Hysminias: see “Macrembolites”
- Ibycus, 32 n. 20, 496
 Idas, 97, 472
 impersonation, see masquerade
 initiation, poetic, 11–14, 62, 68, 143–145, 307–309, 318, 320–321, 326–327, 502–504
 Iollas, 350, 468, 470
- Jason, 83, 88, 89, 90
 Julius Caesar:
 in Virgil, 271, 303, 305, 319 n. 61, 324–326, 328, 340, 376
- komos*, 44, 66, 70, 218, 228, 537
- Lacon, 16, 57, 143, 181, 381, 522
 Laconia/Sparta, 93 n. 13, 97–98, 110, 163, 239, 542, 544
 lament: see “bucolic song”
 Lamon, 496, 502, 503
 Lampourus, 250
 Latin, familiarity with, in Greek authors of the imperial age, 492–493, 508–511
Laus Pisonis, 458
 Leonidas, 149–154 *passim*
leptotes, 3
 Lesbos, 37, 266, 491, 501, 512, 567
 Leucippidae, 98
 Lityerses and *Lityerses* (work song), 32, 33, 56–57 and n. 10, 480
 Locri, 77, 78, 80, 98
locus amoenus, 46, 66–67, 72, 100, 142, 153, 156–158, 181–184; 191, 437–440, 566 (see also “caves”)
locus horridus:
 in Ovid, 436–437, 440–441
 in Virgil, 434
 in Seneca’s tragedies, 427–449 *passim*; 436–437 & 440–441 (description by negation)
 and female imagery, 436
 and sublimity, 445–447
 and underworld:
 in Seneca’s *HF*, 428–430
 in Seneca’s *Oed.*, 430–436
 in Virgil, 428 n. 9, 430 (see also “caves”)
 “Longinus”, *On sublimity*, 445–446
 Longus the Sophist, 10, 16, 17, 186, 191 n. 105, 193, 217, 479–513 *passim*
 and Theocritus, 481–495
 and Virgil, 491–492
 Byzantine fortune of, 550 and n. 13, 552–554, 560, 564–568, 570
 Lucian of Samosata, 510
 Lucretius: see “bucolic poetry”
 Libya, 30 n. 15, 54, 93 n. 11, 237
 Lycaenion, 492, 494 n. 44, 495
 Lycaon, 435
 Lycidas, 28 and n. 9, 33 and n. 24, 34, 35, 36–38, 39, 40 and n. 51, 43, 64–67, 133, 134, 143–144, 203, 205, 252, 273, 286, 307, 309, 321–322, 365, 387–390, 396–397, 399, 468; 485–488 and 501 (as model for Longus’ Philetas);
 Lycophron, 172 n. 23
 Lycophronides, 164
 Lycoris, 343, 386 n. 41, 401, 402
 Lycotas, 458, 461, 475
 lyre, 15, 18, 19, 406, 413–415
 lyric/elegiac poetry/meters: see “bucolic poetry”
- Macrembolites, Eustathius, 549, 571–579
 and Theocritus, 572–576

- magic: see "bucolic poetry"
- Mantua, 303, 322–323, 364, 464
- Marsyas (historian), 105
- Marsyas (and Apollo), 414, 539
- Martial, 313–314, 322 and n. 70, 511 n. 38
- masquerade, bucolic, IX, 44, 253 n. 43, 271, 407, 411, 517–523 *passim*
- Medea, 78, 83, 87, 88, 89, 214, 221, 334 n. 36, 534
- Melanthius, 5, 13
- Meleager of Gadara, 69, 165 n. 52, 205 n. 177, 264, 276 n. 4, 356, 413 and n. 20
- Meliboeus, 263–265, 267–268, 270, 284, 290, 306, 309–310, 325, 355, 370–379 *passim*, 393–394, 398–399, 458, 465
- Menalcas, 59–61, 178–179, 182–183, 185, 194, 195 n. 120, 203, 253, 255, 271, 284, 286, 292, 305, 316, 321–327 *passim*, 355, 362, 363, 365, 387–392 *passim*, 394, 399
- Menon, 27 n. 5
- Mercury, 405–406, 411–413
- Methymna, 500, 512
- Micon, 258, 350, 467, 474, 475
- Midas, 300, 406, 407, 413–416 *passim*, 423, 425
- Miletus, 36, 93, 96 and n. 34, 130, 131
- Milon, 31–33, 50–52, 55–57, 100, 102, 180–181, 182 n. 68, 193, 195 n. 120, 255–256
- mimes, urban *vs* pastoral, 34, 67, 119–146, 206, 236
- mimesis/mimetic, IX, 25, 29, 137, 173 and n. 25, 175–177, 220 and n. 40, 215, 230, 238 n. 10, 239, 263–264, 501, 521, 523
- Mincius, 410–411 n. 17
- Mitylene, 36, 37
- Mnasalcas, 162–165
- Mnasyllus, 19 n. 39, 286
- modes of literary presentation: see "genres, literary"
- Moeris, 286, 321–322, 325, 365, 387–390, 396–397, 399, 469
- Molorchus, 536
- moly*, 87–88, 199
- monologue: see "bucolic poetry"
- Mopsus, 187, 284, 286, 292, 325, 326, 327, 350, 362, 363
- Moschopoulos, Manuel, 551
- Moschus of Syracuse, 167–2210 *passim*, 219, 403, 420, 484 n. 18, 499–500, 504, 505, 550, 552 [Mosch.] 3: see "*Epitaph for Bion*"
- motto, allusive initial, 25–27
- Munatius, 238, 254 n. 46
- Muses, 11–12, 22, 28, 29, 30, 33, 34, 51, 55, 62, 79, 114, 200–201, 222, 226–228, 233, 320, 473 n. 27, 489 Pierian, 31 Sicilian, 328
- Musaeus, 430, 567, 570
- Narcissus, 132 n. 43, 453
- narrative technique: see "bucolic poetry"
- nature *vs* art: see "art *vs* nature"
- nature/landscape: see "bucolic poetry"
- Nemesianus, 464–466 *Ecl.* 1, 465 *Ecl.* 2, 466 *Ecl.* 3, 465 *Ecl.* 6, 465
- Neronian age, 451–458 *passim*, 475–476
- Nicaea, 529–536 *passim*
- Nicias (character of Theocritus), 22, 49 n. 84, 75, 86–87, 93
- Nicias (epigrammatist), 154–159; see also "Anyte and Nicias"
- Nonnus of Panopolis, 407 n. 9, 415, 515–540 *passim*, 550 and Antimachus, 533 and Apollonius Rhodius, 533 and Bion, 525, 527, 532–533 and Callimachus, 533, 536 and the *Epitaph for Bion*, 532–533 and Euphoriion, 533

- and Theocritus, 522, 532–536,
550
Nossis, 28 n. 9, 37
novel: see “bucolic poetry”
Numitorius, *Antibucolica*, 404 n.3, 451
Nymphs, 22, 33 n. 24, 62, 66, 67,
148, 152, 155, 443, 473 n. 27, 489,
497, 532
Octavian:
in Donatus, 302–303
in panegyric epic, 319 n. 61, 411
n. 17
in Servius, 304–305
in Virgil, 305–316 *passim*, 318,
324–326, 328–329, 375, 376,
377
Odysseus, 19–21, 87–88, 105–107,
160, 199–200, 362
Oedipus, 433–435, 443 n. 50
Ornytus, 462
Oromedon, 203, 251
Orpheus, 15, 198, 221–224, 233–234,
268, 436–437
Ovid, 204, 210, 221, 227, 281, 291,
298, 299, 300, 333, 388, 389 n. 51,
392, 396 n. 63, 403–425, 426 n. 4,
434–438, 440, 444, 445, 448, 449,
453, 462
and Calpurnius, 462–463, 467,
473
and Theocritus, 403–425 *passim*
and Virgilian *Bucolics*, 299–300,
403–425 *passim*
Metamorphoses, 403–425 *passim*
see also “*locus horridus*”
paidika, 36
Pan, 39, 40, 43, 44, 148, 152,
155, 164, 197–198, 218, 223,
231, 251–252, 289, 405, 406,
407, 408, 410, 413–416, 465,
469, 480 n. 4, 497, 502–503,
524–525, 532, 536, 537, 541,
575
Pandaros, 527
panpipe: see *syrix*
paraklausithyron, 34 and n. 27, 39, 40,
42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 70–72, 219, 233
Paris, XVI, 4–5, 13, 17, 173, 191
n. 103, 540–547
pastoral:
definition of, VII–XIII, 126–127
retreat, as feature of, 141
scene changes in mime *vs*
pastoral, 121–122
simplicity, as feature of, 141–145
symmetry, as feature of, 137–140
vs bucolic, VII, 126–129
weak *vs* strong, XI–XII, 151 and
n. 13, 394 and n. 60
pathetic fallacy, 10 n. 19, 100, 183,
186, 194, 196–197, 206, 223, 242,
243, 265, 327, 416, 434, 438, 500
pax Augusta/pax Ptolemaica, 269–270
Peleus, 296, 540
Pentheus, 433, 532 n. 55, 538
Persephone, 132, 148, 222–223, 232,
566
Phalasarna, tablet of, 77, 80
pharmakon: see “bucolic song as cure
for love”
Philetas, 482, 485–497, 500–506, 511
n. 35, 512
as ‘symbolic synthesis’ of
Theocritus, Virgil, and
Longus, 486–492
Philius, 11, 40, 42, 61, 62, 66, 94
and n. 20, 483
Philip II, 105
Philitas of Cos, 3, 11, 14, 23 n. 47, 28
n. 9, 94–96, 322, 501
as model of Longus, 490–491, 501
Philodemus, 508–509
Philopoemen, 492
Philoxenus of Cythera, 1 n. 1, 20–
21, 76, 82, 83, 85, 105, 213, 228,
252, 271, 372 n. 1
Photius, 551
Phrasidamus, 65, 66, 67, 70, 373, 374
Phrygia/Phrygian, 5, 56, 406, 414,
416, 480, 538, 544
Phthia, 558–559
Phyllis, 385, 468

- Pindar, 83, 113, 341, 356, 415, 497,
 524 n. 27, 531
 edition of, 341
Hymn to Pan, 415
- Planudes, Maximus, 549–551
- Plato, 6–7, 14, 20, 25, 27, 48, 49,
 206, 239, 354–355, 435, 496 n. 50,
 551
Phaedrus, 23, 39–40 and n. 50,
 206, 372 and n. 9, 397 n. 66,
 438, 559, 570
- Plautus, 267–268, 410 n. 16
- Plutarch, 8, 105, 508–509
- Pollio: see “Asinius Pollio”
- Polybius, 508
- Polydeuces: see “Dioscuri”
- polyeideia*: see “genres, literary”
- Polyphemus, 19–22, 34 and n. 26,
 44–48, 58–59, 71–72, 75–76, 81–
 82, 84–90, 92–93, 104–107, 113,
 173, 182, 184, 185 n. 82, 186, 191,
 198–199, 201 n. 158, 202 n. 162,
 203, 213 n. 19, 223, 228–233, 256,
 259–261, 391–393, 406, 407, 416–
 423 *passim*, 523 n. 24, 564–565,
 567, 570, 575–576
- Poseidon, 107 n. 81, 521
- Posidippus of Pella, 21, 45 n. 70, 91,
 93, 95, 109, 111
- praise: see “panegyric” and “bucolic
 poetry”
- Praxinoa, 111, 119–146 *passim*
- Prodromus, Theodorus, 549, 551–
 557, 578–579
 and Achilles Tatius, 553–554
propemptikon, 37, 38 n. 42, 44, 61
- Propertius, 199, 273 n. 33, 333, 453,
 462, 566
- Proteus, 71
- proverbs, in Theocritus’ urban *vs*
 bucolic idylls, 138–140
- psychagogia*, 22, 23
- Ptolemies, 91–117 *passim*
- Ptolemy I, 97
- Ptolemy II, 95–97, 109–110, 112,
 113–116, 141, 268, 269, 301 n. 3
- Pyrrhus, 101, 102, 108, 109, 114, 117
- Quintus of Smyrna, 511
- recusatio*, 201, 227, 314–320, 359, 539
 n. 81
- reeds: see “bucolic song and the
 music of reeds”
- Rhyndacus, 533
- rota Vergili*, 280
- rustic *vs* urban, 11, 34, 39, 40 and
 n. 52, 44, 46, 53, 61, 65–67, 70,
 72, 119–146 *passim*, 165, 177, 206,
 214, 370, 400, 439, 453, 480 n. 3,
 496 n. 50, 559
- Rhinthon, 28 n. 9
- Rhodanthe and Dosicles*: see “Prodro-
 mus”
- Rhodopis (Dorica), 38
- Rhodopis (character of Achilles
 Tatius), 480 n. 4
- Sapphic fourteen-syllable pentame-
 ter, 27
- pentasyllable, 27 n. 6
- Sappho, 27, 32, 37, 38, 39, 44, 51, 52,
 72, 193, 420, 484, 495, 496
 Alexandrian edition of, 27
- Satyrs/satyr, 13, 19, 88, 192, 231,
 251, 348, 419, 443, 480, 507, 536,
 59 n. 80, 552, 553, 555
- Satyrus, 251
- Scopadae, 98–99, 113, 115
- Scylla, 406, 407, 422
- Selinous, 77
- Semele, 524
- Seneca, the Elder, 388 n. 47, 418
- Seneca, the Younger, 418, 427–450
passim
 and Lucretius, 432, 435, 438
 and Greek tragedy, 427
Apocolocyntosis, 454
Hercules furens, 428–430, 436, 441
Oedipus, 430–436, 441, 443
Phaedra, 439
Thyestes, 441, 443
- Servius and Servius auctus:
 on addressee of *Ecl.* 8, 311
 on *Aeneid*, 302–303

- on allegory, 304–305, 308, 310
 on praise, 304, 327, 330
 shade, 149, 150, 152, 153, 156, 277–
 280, 288, 430–436
 Sicily, 92–93, 117
 Silenus, 251, 286, 287, 299, 416
 Silvanus, 473
 Simaetha, 44 n. 67, 122, 128, 214
 Simichidas, 28 and n. 9, 33, 35–44
 passim, 61–62, 70, 94, 133, 134,
 143–144, 173 n. 28, 203, 223, 243–
 244, 252–254, 265, 271, 273, 309
 n. 31, 397, 483, 501
 Simonides, 40 n. 51, 42 and n. 61,
 98–99, 115
 Simus, 109, 157
 Sirens, 79, 520
skolia, 35, 63
 Socrates, 6, 19, 23, 39, 48 n. 77, 49,
 354, 356, 397
Song of Songs, 576
 Sophocles, 17, 434–435
 Sophron, 107, 123, 217, 236
 Sositheus: *Daphnis or Lityerses*, 56 and
 n. 11, 173, 213, 480
 Sparta: see “Laconia”
 springs, 155–158
 Staphylus, 480 n. 4
 Stesichorus, 32 n. 20; 2, 213 and
 nn. 18–19 (iunior?)
 stichomythia, 100 n. 54, 170, 175–
 176, 218
 Stobaeus, 167 n. 4, 168, 177 n. 44,
 209
 strophic structuring, 31, 172, 178
 n. 48
 Sybaris, 93, 103–104, 117
 symposium/sympotic motifs, 25,
 26, 38, 40, 42, 43, 48–49, 62–67,
 70–71, 108, 110, 133–134, 179, 246,
 252
syrinx, 4, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 22, 60,
 64, 148, 152, 162, 163, 164, 165,
 177 n. 44, 183, 197–198, 214, 217,
 223, 230 n. 65, 263, 264, 283–284,
 289, 292, 298 n. 54, 320, 326, 345,
 405–417 *passim*, 444, 476 n. 37,
 480 n. 4, 484, 487, 502–505, 518–
 538 *passim*, 545, 546, 560, 575, 541
 Syrinx (Nymph), 281 n. 13, 405, 410,
 480 n. 4, 503, 560, 575 n. 89
 Tammuz, 132 n. 41
 Tarentum, 98, 103
 Telemus, 48 n. 79
 Thalysia, 11, 23, 40, 143 n. 66, 326
 n. 88
 Theaetetus, 238, 254 n. 46
 Theiodamas, 97, 101, 103
 Theocritus:
 ancient exegesis of, 238–262
 passim, 404
 and Ptolemaic patronage, 91–117
 passim
 Antinoe papyrus, 92 n. 7, 116
 Berenice, 116
 Byzantine fortune of, 550–551,
 560–570, 571, 573–574, 575–
 576, 578
 formal aspects/topics/geography
 in the *Idylls* of, 92–117, 120–
 122, 126, 128, 137, 173, 212–213
 Galatea, 106
 hexametrical versification in,
 125–126 and n. 20, 256
 Id. 1, 9, 15, 29–31, 41–42 n. 58,
 44, 54–55, 59, 62, 64, 112, 138,
 145, 168 n. 5, 178, 180, 180,
 187, 191, 192, 202, 222, 263–
 265, 267, 327, 373 and n. 13,
 384, 385 n. 40, 409, 504, 532,
 533, 534, 550, 552, 561–563,
 569, 572–575, 578
 Id. 2, 122, 128, 212, 213–215, 469,
 534, 565–566
 Id. 3, 34, 44–46, 70–71, 219, 254,
 260, 278 n. 7, 379–381, 483
 Id. 4, 17, 99–103, 192, 193
 Id. 5, 57–58, 103–105, 143, 181,
 183, 189, 257–259, 381, 522
 Id. 6, 9–10, 15, 34–35, 47–49,
 58–59, 104–107, 177, 184, 186,
 187, 191, 194, 283, 391–392,
 420, 567, 575

- Id.* 7, 22, 33–34, 35–44, 61–67, 94,
 133–134, 136 n. 31, 143–144,
 145, 174–175, 177, 184, 191,
 203, 204, 206, 215, 223, 254,
 256, 260, 271, 288, 307, 309
 n. 31, 322, 327, 373–374, 483,
 487–488, 497, 501–502, 532
[Id. 8], 59–61, 168–169, 172, 174,
 178–180, 182, 183, 184, 185,
 187 n. 89, 189, 193–195, 206,
 215–216, 253, 283
[Id. 9], 77–78, 80–81, 87, 169–
 170, 174–175, 182, 183, 199,
 204–205, 206, 223, 253
Id. 10, 31–33, 50–52, 55–56, 256,
 50
Id. 11, 34, 21–21, 71–72, 75–76,
 85–89, 104–107, 177, 186, 191,
 200–201, 213, 259–261, 283,
 390–391, 401, 420–421, 482,
 483, 523 n. 25, 564–565, 575
Id. 13, 86, 97, 211
Id. 14, 67–70, 107–111, 467, 566
Id. 15, 107, 111–112, 119–146, 212,
 467
Id. 16, 9, 113–116, 146
Id. 17, 95–96, 112, 114–116, 146,
 269
Id. 18, 112, 220–221
[Id. 19], 219, 562, 563
[Id. 20], 170, 181, 184, 210 n. 10,
 217, 260, 533
Id. 22, 97, 100, 213
[Id. 23], 219, 233
Id. 24, 287
[Id. 27], 170–171, 175–176, 185,
 191, 193, 217, 260
Id. 28, 36, 44, 221
Prolegomena to the *scholia*, 9, 204
 n. 175, 238–240
Syrinx, 177 n. 44
 Theon, 238, 239 n. 16
 Thessaly, 5 n. 11, 69, 70, 93 n. 13,
 108
 Thetis, 296, 540
 Thrasy-machus, 6
 Thuri, 103–105
 Thymoetas, 465, 466
 Thyonichus, 67–70, 108–109, 468
 Thyphon, 517, 522, 538, 540
 Thyrsis, 29, 30–31, 33, 54–55, 62, 64,
 131, 148, 174, 186, 195, 196, 197,
 350, 468, 575
 Tibullus, 333, 419, 453
 Timaeus, 53–54, 65, 105 n. 76, 213
 n. 18, 229 n. 63, 504 n. 15
 Timotheus, 1 n. 2, 213 n. 19
 Tyro/*Tyro*, 17, 521
 Tityrus, 64, 133, 134, 264, 270–273,
 251, 252, 263–265, 270, 271, 272,
 278, 285, 288, 289, 290, 291, 305–
 310 *passim*, 355, 359–360, 365,
 369–381 *passim*, 393, 398, 465,
 466, 493, 502, 504, 506
 Tmolus (mount), 406, 407, 408 n. 11,
 414, 415
 Triphiodorus, 511, 515
 Trullo, Council of, 554–555, 557
 urban: see “rustic *vs* urban”
 Varius, 322 and n. 71
 Varus: see “Alfenus Varus”
 villas, Roman, 422–423
 Virgil:
 familiarity with, in Greek authors
 of the Imperial age, 510–511
 life of, as mirror of history of
 human culture according to
 Donatus, 280
 according to Vida, 282
 statue of, 510
 Aeneid, 331–332, 451, 469, 511, 544
 (see also “*locus horridus*”)
 Eclogues:
 absence of dramatic unity in,
 335–337
 as poetry book, 333–367 *passim*
 closure in, 345–346, 398–402
 dedication of, 310–316
 didacticism in, 282–288
 fragmentation in, 338, 357,
 365–366, 379, 382–393
 passim, 417

- framing in, 378–382, 384, 390, 395, 400
 history in, 369–370, 375–378, 387, 389–390, 393–395, 397–399
 intratextuality in, 357–361
 memory in, 384 n. 39; 387; 390; 393–394; 396; 399
 mimesis of orality in, 336; 348–349; 361–363; 396
 panegyric in, 301–332 *passim*
 reflexive annotation in, 372–376, 388, 390, 399
 textual self-awareness in, 361–366
 titles, of, 319
 see also “bucolic poetry, Romanization of”
Ecl. 1, 263–272 *passim*, 276, 283, 288–290, 305–310, 325, 328, 342, 347, 351, 352, 355, 359, 364, 369–378 *passim*, 383, 394, 398, 413, 432, 460, 500
Ecl. 2, 198–199, 342, 345, 347, 348, 355, 356, 382–383, 502–503, 505–507
Ecl. 3, 315–317, 329, 342, 344, 345, 347, 350, 383, 473
Ecl. 4, 287–288, 293–300 *passim*, 328–332, 342, 346–347, 351, 457
Ecl. 5, 187, 271, 284–285, 291, 299, 325–328, 342, 345, 350, 351, 355, 362, 363, 364, 376–377, 382–386, 412
Ecl. 6, 272–273, 283, 291–292, 317–321, 343, 348, 355, 356, 359, 364, 416, 473
Ecl. 7, 349–350, 355, 356, 364, 379, 381, 382
Ecl. 8, 310–316, 348, 356, 457
Ecl. 9, 321–325, 363–365, 379–380, 384–385, 387–390, 393–394, 399, 500
Ecl. 10, 187, 207, 272, 277, 320–321, 343, 344, 345, 351, 352, 362, 366, 432
Georgics, 308, 315, 317, 322, 461, 467, 468, 469, 474
 Xenea, 64, 133
 Zethus, 16–19 *passim*
 Zeus, 33, 61, 114, 139, 219, 301 n. 3, 309 n. 31, 407, 415, 487, 517, 522

INDEX OF PASSAGES DISCUSSED

Achilles Tatius

2.2: 554 n. 26

2.3: 553

2.14.4, 4.4.7, 4.12.1: 577 n. 96

Adaeus

AP 6.228 = *GPh* 1ff.: 160 n. 36

Aelianus

VH 9.14: 3 n. 5

10.18: 2 n. 3

13.22: 266 n. 13

Aelius Donatus

Vit. Verg. 19 Diehl: 302

23–24: 280

49: 248 n. 28

61–63: 303

64: 302

Aeschines

Tim. 145: 231 n. 68

Aeschylus

Eum. 78: 16 n. 30

[*PV*] 574: 518 n. 11

Agathias Scholasticus

AP 5.296.1–3: 550 n. 11

5.299.9: 550 n. 11

6.80: 550 n. 13

Alcaeus

58.12 Voigt: 26 n. 3

102: 51

332.1–2: 26 n. 3

335.3–4: 26 n. 3

338: 51

362: 39 n. 46

368: 27 n. 5

432: 42 n. 59

Alcaeus Messenius

AP 226.3 = *HE* 129: 518 n. 11

Alciphron

2.24.1: 248 n. 29

Anacreon

PMG 357.1–5: 41 n. 55

358.1–4: 41 n. 55

358.1–8: 46, 47

360.1–2: 41 n. 55

376.2: 26 n. 3

417: 45, 46

Anacreontea

35: 562

Anthologia Palatina

adesp. 7.42.5: 30 n. 15

9.713–742: 123 n. 13

Antimachus

fr. inc.sed. 131 Matthews = 53

Wyss: 533

AP 9.321 = *FGE* 45ff.: 163 [205]

Matthews = fr. dub. 149 Wyss

Antipater of Thessalonica

AP 11.20.3–4 = *GP* 187–188: 153

16.305 = *GP* 487ff.: 415

Anyte of Tegea

AP 9.313 = *HE* 726ff.: 154, 156,

157, 160 n. 37

9.314 = *HE* 730ff.: 155

APlan. 228 = *HE* 734ff.: 150, 151,

156, 157, 159

231 = *HE* 738ff.: 152, 153, 158

n. 11

291 = *HE* 672ff.: 155, 158

[Apollodorus]

- Epit.* 3.3.3: 546 n. 101
3.183-185: 132 n. 42

Apollonius Rhodius

- 1.494-515: 15
1.569-579: 15
1.735-741: 19 n. 37
1.1172-1181: 159
3.444-445: 45 n. 71
3.446, 762: 189 n. 97
3.845-850: 88 n. 39
3.1042-1049: 88
4.603-605: 533
Σ 1.236: 211 n. 14
3.106: 32 n. 20

Apollonius of Tyana

- Epist.* 71 Penella: 511 n. 38

Apostolius (paroem.)

- 14.96: 327 n. 92

Appian

- BCiv.* 2.70, 2.79, 4.12, 5.45: 508
n. 24

Aratus

- Phaen.* 783-787: 3 n. 5

Archilochus

- SEG* 15.517 = T 3 Gerber: 13
IEG 122: 197 n. 134
196a: 193
196a26 & 27: 41 n. 57

ps.-Archytas

- (apud Stob. 4.1.138): 15 n. 27

Aristaenetus

- 1.10: 489 n. 27
1.10.58-61: 285 n. 21

Aristophanes

- Ecll.* 847: 258 n. 57
Vesp. 1034: 151 n. 11

Aristotle

- Eth.Nic.* 1161a: 8
Poet. 1448a: 1 n. 2
Rhet. 1395a: 139 n. 61

Artemidorus of Tarsus

- AP* 9.205 = *FGE* 113-114: 223

Athenaeus

- 519-521: 104
541a-b: 104
552b: 3 n. 5
619a-b: 2 n. 3
634c-637a: 519 n. 13

Aulus Gellius

- NA* 19.9.7: 509

Bacchylides

- 19.35-36: 16

Bion

- 1 = *Adon. epit.* 2: 532
3: 532
5: 534
13: 232 n. 70
18: 198
18-19: 196
19-21: 532
22: 198
23-24: 196
26: 532
28: 532
30: 532
31-39: 196, 222
32: 532
32-38: 135 n. 49
33-34: 532
35-39: 532
37-38: 534
38: 532
43: 232 n. 71
45: 525
48-50: 232
52-53: 232
53-54: 528 n. 44
54: 132 n. 42

- 55: 42 n. 58, 222
 57: 226 n. 56
 58–63: 229
 63: 534
 65–66: 222
 67: 534
 68–69: 532
 76: 42 n. 60, 196, 197 n. 131, 222
 79–86: 135 n. 49
 86–92: 196
 96: 132 n. 42
 98: 222
 123–126: 198
 140–141: 221
 2 = [*Epithal. Achill. et Deidam.*] 1: 230
 1–3: 191, 229
 5: 202
 10: 173, 202
 18: 226 n. 55
 fr. 2.1: 230
 2.1–2: 218
 2.17: 289 n. 33
 3: 198, 202 n. 161, 228
 8: 19, 33 n. 23, 202 n. 161, 227, 228
 9.1–2: 226
 9.5: 202 n. 161, 230
 9.11: 230
 10: 23, 189, 190, 226
 10.8: 202 n. 161, 230 n. 65
 13: 190
 14.4–7: 220
 16.4: 228
- Callimachus**
Aetia fr. 1.11–12 Pfeiffer: 3 n. 5
 1.5–6: 283
 1.21–24: 318
 1.24: 3 n. 5
 1.25–28: 154
 1.32–34: 102
 2: 13, 227, 320
 9.7: 227
 18: 97
 24: 97
- 24–25: 103
 64.9: 40 n. 51
 67.1: 48 n. 80, 226
 75.72: 154 n. 20
 84–85: 102
AP 9.507 = *HE* 1297ff.: 3 n. 5
 12.43 = *HE* 1041ff.: 48 n. 81, 153
 12.73 = *HE* 1057ff.: 43 n. 62
 12.150 = *HE* 1047ff.: 22, 81, 82 and n. 23, 200 n. 150, 214 n. 21
Hecale fr. 116 Hollis: 533
Hymn 2.108–109: 373 n. 14
 108–112: 153
Hymn 4.174: 106
Ia. 2, fr. 192.15–16 Pf.: 408 n. 11
Ia. 13, fr. 203.11–14: 36 n. 7
 fr. 229: 13
 459: 533
 616: 102
 758: 102
- Calpurnius Siculus**
Buc. 1.42–45: 331 n. 107
 1.64: 331 n. 107
 1.21: 462
 1.30: 460
 1.92–94: 458
 2.3–4: 461
 2.28: 283 n. 18
 2.28–35: 472
 2.34: 473
 2.36–37: 468
 2.89: 456
 3.49: 460
 4.14–15: 471
 4.25–26: 459
 4.26–36: 330 n. 104
 4.31–49: 458
 4.50–57: 458
 4.53–55: 459
 4.55–57: 459
 4.58–72: 470
 4.62–63: 459
 4.65: 459, 472
 4.65–66: 414

- 4.70: 459, 472
 4.76-77: 473
 4.149-151: 462
 4.157-159: 458
 4.160: 460
 4.160-163: 458
 5.1-4: 474
 5.97: 460
 5.119-121: 474
 6.43: 462
 6.119: 475 n. 34
 7.1: 460
 7.3: 460
 7.5: 461, 475
 7.6: 461
 7.15: 460
 7.28-29: 455
 7.73-75: 458
 7.79: 471, 475
- Catullus
 5.5-6: 210 n. 9
 60: 210 n. 10
 61.209-212: 296 n. 51
 63.29: 524 n. 27
 64.28: 489 n. 27
 64.29-41: 296 n. 51
 64.87-88: 279 n. 10
 64.295: 297 n. 52
 64.407-408: 296
- Cicero
Brut. 276: 448 n. 60
De or. 3.63: 276 n. 3
Luc. 39.5: 509 n. 27
- Cleanthes
CA 4: 226 n. 56
SVF 1.526: 199 n. 149
- Colluthus
 2-4: 545
 5: 547
 17-69: 540
 41-45: 540
 49-58: 540
 62: 541
- 71-72: 541
 87: 541
 102-106: 541
 110-111: 541
 111: 544
 112-113: 541
 114: 541
 115: 541
 116: 541
 116-200: 545
 118: 541
 119-120: 541
 121: 541
 128: 547
 130: 541, 542
 137-145: 541
 146-153: 541
 154-157: 542
 159-166: 542
 167: 542
 168: 542
 171-188: 542
 184: 543
 185: 543
 190-200: 544
 193: 543
 247-325: 543
 276: 543
 278-281: 544
 283-284: 544
 295: 544
 297: 543
 298: 543
 306-314: 544
 309: 543
 326-327: 545
 326-362: 546
 347: 545, 546
 348: 545
 349-350: 546
 351: 545
 352-353: 546
 356: 545
 357: 546
 358: 545
 359-362: 546
 374: 545

- 375: 546
 376–378: 547
 376–386: 546
 378: 547
 383: 547
 387–388: 540
 389–390: 545
- Columella
 7.3.26: 16
- Cratinus
PCG 313: 518 n. 9
- Cyrus
AP 9.136: 550
- Dicaearchus of Messana
 fr. 49 Wehrli: 7
- Dio Chrysostomus
Or. 6.20: 410 n. 15
Or. 56.2: 518 n. 9
- Diodorus Siculus
 1.4: 508 n. 24
 4.84: 53 n. 1, 186 n. 85, 504
- Diogenianus (paroem.)
 5.96: 327 n. 92
- Dionysius Halicarnassensis
Ant.Rom. 1.7.2: 508
Isaeus 11: 204 n. 173
- Duris of Samus
FGrHist. 76F58: 20 n. 41
- Empedocles of Acragas
VS 31B111 = fr. 101 Wright: 83,
 84, 85
- Ennius
Ann. 207 Skutsch: 281 n. 14
- Epicharmus
PCG 70–72: 2 n. 3
- Erycius
AP 6.96 = *GPh* 2200ff.: 488, 511
 7.230 = *GPh* 2268ff.: 511 n. 35
- Etymologicum Genuinum*
 α 381 Lasserre-Livadaras: 252
 n. 39
- Etymologicum Magnum*
 222.25–27 Gaisford: 249 n. 31
- Eugenianus, Nicetas: *Drosilla and Charicles*
 1.77–158: 558
 1.116–119: 558
 1.150–151: 558
 2.81–84: 567
 2.295–303: 569
 3.61–351: 558
 3.65–96: 559
 3.97–100: 559 n. 41
 3.109–113: 559
 3.128–322: 559
 3.263–288: 560
 3.284 & 285: 560 n. 43
 3.297–322: 560
 3.311: 560
 3.339–342: 560 n. 47
 4.105–219: 561
 4.289–290: 561
 4.300–309: 561
 4.313–324: 562
 4.320–321: 563
 4.379–380: 564
 4.387–391: 565
 4.399–401: 566
 4.408–410: 566
 4.411–413: 566
 5.16–17: 566
 5.434–435: 570
 6.62–67: 569 n. 69
 6.205–235: 560 n. 44
 6.367–370: 565
 6.389–390: 567
 6.452–455: 569 n. 69
 6.473–489: 570
 7.268: 558

- 7.272–328: 558
 8.53–88: 568
 8.84–90, 125–130: 568
 8.154–160: 558
- Euphorion
CA 102: 533
- Euripides
Alc. 579: 14, 15
 583–587: 10 n. 18
Cyc. 425: 20
 581–587: 20
 646: 82 n. 23
Hec. 945
Hel. 1482–1484: 14
Hipp. 509–516: 82
IA 316: 543 n. 91
 579–589: 5
IT 303: 203
Or. 1387: 543 n. 91
 [Rhes.] 264–274: 516 n. 5
 551–555: 520 n. 19
 551–556: 541 n. 87
TrGF 3F61b and c: 17 n. 32
 10F136.1–4: 49 n. 84
 12F182a: 18
 12F185.1: 18
 12F188.4: 18
 12F193.2: 18
 12F196.5: 18
 61F663: 49 n. 84, 226
 78F839: 18 n. 34
- Festus
 p. 292 Lindsay = 249 Müller: 326
 n. 88
- Geoponica*
 14.8.3: 248 n. 29
- GVI* (Peck)
 1312 (= *IMEGR* 34): 147
- Hephaestion, *De metris*
 7.7, p. 23.14–17 Consbruch: 27
 n. 6
- Hermesianax
CA 3: 194
- Hermocreon
APlan. 11 = *HE* 1943f.: 148
- Herodas
 4.14–19: 124, 33
 4.41–51: 123
 4.55: 124
 4.72–73: 124
- Herodotus
 1.108–116: 17 n. 31
 1.140: 135 n. 49
 7.31: 559 n. 41
- Hesiod
Op. 117–118: 196 n. 129
 228: 6
 234: 6
 582–584: 3
Theog. 1–34: 11
 22–35: 143, 502
 22–23: 283
 23: 23
 24–26: 284
 26–28: 11, 12
 27: 13, 227
 62: 13
 88: 200
 [Sc.] 318: 552 n. 24
 Σ *Theog.* 26: 12 n. 20
 Σ *Op.*, *Proleg.* Ab.1, p. 2.4–5
 Pertusi: 204 n. 173
- Hesychius
Lex. τ 996–997 Schmidt: 264
- Himerius
Or. 54.1: 518 n. 11
- Hippocrates
Morb. sacr. 1.10–12 Grensemann:
 84
 1.29–30: 84 n. 32

Homer

- Il.* 1.604: 180
 1.86–89: 160
 3.39: 543 n. 91
 3.151–152: 3
 4.452–455: 151 n. 11
 6.21–28: 533
 6.420: 532 n. 57
 13.799: 250
 16.391–392: 151 n. 11
 18.98–99: 231 n. 68
 18.377: 552 n. 24
 18.483–608: 4
 18.525–526: 4, 12
 18.561–572: 556 n. 35
 21.34: 187 n. 89
 21.276, 604: 521
 22.430–515: 532 n. 55
 23.583: 32
 24.29–30: 5 n. 9
 24.260–262: 12, 13
Od. 4.435–459: 539
 5.453–454: 160
 7.245: 529
 9.19–20: 544
 9.32: 529
 9.111: 424: 417
 9.244–249: 573 n. 83
 9.315: 417
 9.341–342: 573 n. 83
 9.346: 573 n. 83
 9.481: 418
 9.508–510: 48 n. 79
 10.287–288, 305–306: 87
 10.291, 326: 521
 12.40: 521
 13.31–34: 160
 17.204–259: 5
 17.487: 6
 Σ Hom. *Il.* 14.342–351: 235 n. 2
Il. 13.390 and *Od.* 7.115–116: 246
HDem. 183: 32
 227–230: 78, 79
 227–228: 80
HDion. 40–41: 524 n. 28
HHerm. 511–112: 16
HPan. 19: 532 n. 57

Horace

- C.* 1.6.1–2: 322, 323
 1.12.47: 324 n. 77
 2.1.9–12: 311 n. 36
 2.1.16: 311 n. 36
 2.19: 443, 446 n. 59
 3.13.1: 420
 3.13.3–7: 420
 3.25: 443
 3.25.18: 446, 3.25.1: 446
 4.2.53–60: 317 n. 56
 4.5.29–32: 269
Epist. 1.18.41–44: 18 n. 35
 1.19.19–35: 309 n. 30
 2.1.156–160: 267, 268
 2.2.124–125: 419 n. 30
 2.67, 68: 452
Sat. 1.5.63: 419
 1.10.42–43: 311 n. 36, 314
 n. 46

Hyginus

- Fab.* 8: 18 n. 33
 165: 539 n. 80

Isidorus

- Etym.* 8.7.11: 121 n. 4

Juvenal

- 9.62: 524 n. 27

Leonidas

- AP* 7.657 = *HE* 2062ff.: 148
 n. 3
 9.25 = *HE* 2572ff.: 3 n. 5
 9.326: 155
APlan. 171 = *HE* 2585ff.: 163
 230 = *HE* 2498ff.: 149, 150

[Longinus]

- Subl.* 9.6: 445
 35.4: 445, 446

Longus

- Proem.* 3: 550 n. 13, 565 n. 57
 1.10: 503
 1.13.4: 490 n. 29

- 1.15.2: 553
 1.16.4: 507
 1.17.4: 495
 1.18.1: 495
 1.23.3: 553
 1.27: 16
 1.28-31: 500
 1.29: 505 n. 16
 1.32.3: 243
 1.8.2: 529 n. 47
 2.12-29: 500
 2.2.1: 553
 2.3: 485, 505 n. 16
 2.3.2: 488, 489
 2.3.3: 495, 496
 2.3-7: 500
 2.5.1: 491
 2.5.3: 487, 492, 493
 2.5.4: 495, 496
 2.7.4-6: 490, 493
 2.7.6: 482 n. 9, 484, 506
 2.7.7: 482, 565
 2.30.2: 490 n. 29
 2.33: 502
 2.33.3-34.1: 575 n. 89
 2.34: 503
 2.35: 503
 2.37: 504
 3.9-11: 553
 3.13.3: 567, 568
 3.14.3: 495
 3.18: 283 n. 18
 3.19: 283 n. 18
 4.2.5: 204 n. 170
 4.11-20: 500
 4.20: 14 n. 24
 4.39.2: 518 n. 8
 4.40: 283 n. 18
 6.440-453: 567
- Lucian of Samosata
Dear. iud. 4: 5 n. 9
Pod. 314: 539 n. 80
- Lucretius
 1.38: 276 n. 3
 1.114-117: 276 n. 1
- 1.118: 277 n. 6
 1.166: 294
 1.407-409: 276 n. 1
 1.928-929: 277 n. 6
 1.939-940: 286
 2.29-33: 432, 438
 2.55-56: 286
 2.137: 294 n. 48
 2.349: 298 n. 53
 2.349-350: 296 n. 51
 2.352-366: 298 n. 53
 2.630-631: 287 n. 25
 2.663: 276 n. 3
 2.646-651: 297
 2.1038-1039: 299
 2.1093-1094: 297
 2.1146: 293 n. 48
 2.1150: 293
 2.1151-1152: 294 n. 48
 2.1153-1154: 293
 2.1157-1159: 294 n. 48
 2.1167: 294 n. 48
 3.18-30: 299 n. 58
 3.28-29: 446
 3.87-88: 286
 3.307-313: 295
 3.312: 297
 3.319-322: 295
 3.978-979: 435
 4.572-594: 289
 4.578-579: 287 n. 26
 4.580-589: 373 n. 15
 4.580-594: 287
 4.581: 281 n. 14
 4.582: 287 n. 25
 4.589: 276
 4.598: 264
 5.1-54: 306 n. 20
 5.7-12: 290
 5.8: 377
 5.22-51: 287
 5.200-217: 438
 5.780: 298
 5.818: 298
 5.907-912: 299
 5.821-836: 294
 5.834-836: 294

- 5.917: 294 n. 49
 5.933–936: 296 n. 51
 5.943: 298
 5.948: 279 n. 8
 5.967: 279 n. 8
 5.970: 279 n. 8
 5.1016: 276 n. 3
 5.1245: 279 n. 8
 5.1361–1378: 279 n. 8
 5.1379–1407: 289
 5.1382: 417
 5.1382–1383: 284
 5.1383–1384: 285
 5.1388: 281 n. 15
 5.1389: 290
 5.1392–1393: 277
 5.1393: 289
 5.1395–1398: 289 n. 33
 5.1397–1398: 244
 5.1398: 277
 5.1399–1400: 292
 5.1411: 279 n. 8
 5.1423–1424: 289 n. 33
 5.1454–1457: 275 n. 1
 6.7–8: 291
 6.35–36: 286
 6.760–761: 432
 6.783–785: 277, 431
 6.786–787: 277
 6.788–790: 432
- Lycophronides
PMG 844: 164
- Macrembolites
 1.4.3: 572
 1.5.2–3: 575
 1.5.4: 572
 1.5.8: 573, 577 n. 96
 2.1.4: 577 n. 96
 2.6: 574 n. 85
 2.7: 574 n. 85, 577 n. 96
 2.9: 574 n. 85
 2.10.4: 577 n. 96
 4.3.3: 571 n. 76
 4.6: 574, 575
 4.6.2: 575
- 4.6.3: 574 n. 84, 575
 4.12.1: 577 n. 96
 4.17.1: 577
 6.3.2: 571 n. 76
 9.4.1: 571 n. 76
- Macrobius
 5.16.12: 388 n. 47
- Marianus
AP 9.627.1–2: 160 n. 36
- Marmor Parium*
FGrHist. 239A73: 213 n. 18
- Martial
 6.17: 38 n. 511
 6.3: 329 n. 102
 8.55(56).7–8: 322 n. 70
 8.82.7–8: 313
- Meleager
AP 7.195 = *HE* 4058ff.: 205
 n. 177, 413 n. 20
 7.196 = *HE* 4066ff.: 165 n. 52,
 205 n. 177, 264, 276
- Memnon of Heraclea
FGrHist. 434: 532 n. 56
- Menander
Epit. 325–333: 17
Sam. 530, 596: 16 n. 30
- Messalla Corvinus
SH 558a: 201 n. 158, 209
 n. 1
- Mnasalcas
AP 9.324 = *HE* 2663ff.: 162
- Moschus of Syracuse
 1 = *Eros fug.* 190
 2 = *Eur.* 6, 8: 231
 97–98: 520 n. 17
 3 = [*Bion. epit.*] 3–4: 180
 7: 184 n. 77, 534

- 11-12: 224, 534
 18: 534
 22: 234
 25: 223
 26-29: 188
 30-35: 223
 34: 222
 37-44: 533
 43: 226 n. 55
 47: 197
 48: 179 n. 56
 55-56: 331 n. 106
 65: 205
 51-54: 518 n. 11
 70-89: 205
 77: 205
 80-81: 319
 80-84: 223
 82: 202 n. 161
 89: 37
 90-91: 37
 93-97: 176, 224, 266
 94-96: 283 n. 18
 96: 222
 103-104: 210 n. 9
 109: 202 n. 161
 115-119: 222
 118: 224
 118-120: 205
 119-125: 233
 120: 202 n. 161
 124: 202 n. 161
 fr. 3.7-8: 226
 fr. 5.8: 242
AP 9.440: 209
 16.200 = *HE* 2683ff.: 190
APlan. 200: 219
- Nicander
Ther. 227: 159
 fr. 69 Gow-Schofield: 489 n. 27
- Nicias
AP 9.315 = *HE* 2771ff.: 154
 apud *Arg. Theocr. Id.* 11, p. 240
 Wendel: 48 n. 80
- Nonnus
Dion. praef. 3: 497
 1.1-44: 539
 1.29-30: 507
 1.36-37: 540
 1.37-38: 539
 1.39-41: 539
 1.47: 522
 1.74-75: 532
 1.97: 522
 1.124: 521
 1.145-320: 517
 1.155: 517
 1.295: 407, 517
 1.322: 517
 1.344-345: 517
 1.373: 407, 518, 521
 1.374: 521
 1.376: 407, 518
 1.381: 517
 1.387: 518
 1.387-407: 517
 1.394-395: 520
 1.399-400: 415
 1.404-405: 520
 1.406: 520
 1.406-407: 522
 1.408: 517
 1.408-464: 521
 1.412: 518
 1.423-424: 407
 1.424: 522, 523
 1.427: 522
 1.437: 518
 1.439-443: 522
 1.444-464: 522
 1.447: 518
 1.449: 518
 1.453: 518
 1.467-475: 522 n. 24
 1.474: 518
 1.482: 522
 1.505: 518
 1.521: 407, 521
 1.521-524: 520
 1.533-534: 520
 1.525-534: 521

- 1.521-524: 520
 1.525-535: 520
 2.3: 518
 2.7: 506
 2.11-19: 520
 2.3: 521
 2.13: 520
 2.15: 520, 522
 2.19: 521
 2.21: 518
 2.22-659: 517
 2.33: 502
 2.32-37: 503
 2.34: 503
 2.35: 503
 2.61-62: 523
 2.660-695: 522
 3.234-242: 523 n. 26
 4.15: 507
 5.229-241: 524
 5.242-260: 524
 5.261-267: 524
 5.268: 524
 5.288-296: 525
 5.297: 525
 5.333: 525
 5.337-365: 525
 5.354: 526
 5.415: 526
 5.415-432: 525
 5.473: 525
 5.473-496: 526
 5.494: 526
 5.497: 526
 7.48-54: 523 n. 26
 8.14: 524
 8.17: 524
 8.20-23: 524
 8.25: 524
 8.29: 524
 10.175: 526
 10.175-11.252: 527
 10.176: 527
 10.178-216: 527
 10.188: 527
 10.190: 527
 10.224: 526
 10.230-242: 526
 10.230-234: 539
 10.238-249: 527
 10.243-245: 526
 10.251: 526
 10.278: 527
 10.329: 526
 10.330-338: 527
 10.339-382: 527
 10.386-391: 526
 11.113: 527
 11.214: 527
 11.245: 527
 11.255-350: 528
 11.325-327: 528
 11.351: 528
 11.361: 528
 11.431-477: 528
 11.482-483: 529
 14.404: 531
 15.71-72: 532
 15.175: 530
 15.182-183: 530
 15.184-186: 530
 15.192-193: 530
 15.198: 530
 15.204: 529
 15.208: 529 n. 47
 15.209-214: 529
 15.213: 529
 15.214-219: 530
 15.220: 529, 530
 15.221-228: 530
 15.230: 529
 15.237-243: 529
 15.244: 529
 15.258-270: 530
 15.290-296: 530
 15.303: 529
 15.308: 529
 15.306-311: 530
 15.308: 529
 15.310: 529
 15.312: 529
 15.316-341: 530
 15.361: 529
 15.361-362: 528 n. 46

- 15.370-419: 529
 15.370-422: 530, 550, 551
 n. 13
 15.371: 532
 15.372-373: 532, 534
 15.374: 534
 15.377-378: 534
 15.380: 532
 15.381: 534
 15.381-382: 533
 15.382: 534
 15.384-385: 532
 15.386-388: 534
 15.389: 532
 15.390: 529, 532
 15.391: 532
 15.392-393: 534
 15.395: 532
 15.396-397: 532
 15.398: 529
 15.399: 529, 533
 15.400-401: 534
 15.403, 409, 414: 533
 15.404-406: 533
 15.404-408: 534
 15.407-408: 532
 15.411-437: 531
 15.415-416: 534, 535
 15.416-418: 539
 15.417: 529, 532
 15.417-419: 535
 15.419: 529
 15.420: 532
 16.254: 535
 16.265-291: 535
 16.285: 535
 16.306: 536
 16.307: 536
 16.319: 536
 16.324: 536
 16.328-330: 536
 17.37-86: 540
 17.39-51: 536
 17.43-45: 536
 17.46: 536
 17.50-54: 536
 17.69-70: 536
 17.72: 537
 17.74-80: 536
 17.78: 537
 17.80: 537
 17.81-86: 537
 17.82: 536
 17.172-175: 537
 18.5-92: 537
 18.103: 537
 18.104: 537
 18.105: 537
 18.107: 537
 19.329: 539 n. 80
 20.300-307: 537
 20.327-328: 537
 20.333-342: 537
 20.334a, 335: 537
 20.335-338: 537
 21.135-146: 537
 23.192-224: 538
 24.35-40: 538
 24.151-154: 538
 25.21: 531
 25.268: 531
 25.237-241: 538 n. 78
 25.253-263: 539 n. 81
 26.14-15: 538
 27.221-227: 538
 27.227: 538 n. 76
 28.41-44: 538
 29.283-290: 538
 29.15-178: 527
 29.17: 528
 29.87: 528
 29.102: 528
 29.154: 528
 29.161: 528
 39.124-128: 538
 40.101-124: 531 n. 55,
 532
 41.129: 541
 41.372-373: 535
 42.185-188: 540
 43.70-74: 538
 45.175-215: 538
 45.183: 538
 45.185: 538

- 45.186: 538
 45.189: 538
 45.200–203: 538
 45.208: 538
 46.283–319: 532 n. 55
 47.627–628: 538 n. 78
 48.594: 536
 48.628–630: 535
- Nossis
AP 7.201 = *HE* 2831ff.: 37
 7.414 = *HE* 2827ff.: 28 n. 9
 7.418 = *HE* 2831ff.: 28 n. 9
 7.718 = *HE* 2831ff.: 37
- Numitorius
Antibucolica (*FLP* p. 284): 404 n. 3
- Oppian
Σ Hal. 3.243 & 5.579: 248 n. 29
- Ovid
Am. 1.1–2: 190, 1: 227
 3.1.1–4: 444, 445
 3.1.25: 314 n. 46
 3.12: 392
Ars am. 1.7–8, 17–18: 227
Fast. 6.703: 539 n. 80
Met. 1.190: 435
 1.471: 410
 1.664–723: 406
 1.668–688: 16
 1.674–677: 411
 1.679–681: 412
 1.683–684: 409
 1.705–712: 408
 1.711–712: 409
 1.713–723: 16
 1.735–736: 412
 2.31: 300 n. 60
 2.326–328: 528 n. 46
 2.680–685: 407 n. 8
 2.687–707: 407 n. 8
 3.143–147: 441
 3.155–164: 440
 3.177: 440
 4.276–277: 407 n. 8
 4.284: 300
 6.11.52: 414
 6.13: 414
 6.383: 539 n. 80
 6.384–385: 414
 8.155–156: 299
 10.86–87: 437
 10.92: 422 n. 36
 10.97: 422 n. 36
 10.143: 422
 11.126–127: 300
 11.146–192: 406
 11.146–147: 416
 11.154: 409
 11.152: 408 n. 11
 11.161–163: 416
 11.164: 416
 11.169: 415
 11.190–193: 408
 12.175: 300 n. 60
 13.765–766: 417
 13.750–898: 406
 13.764–767: 418
 13.778–779: 422
 13.784: 409, 416
 13.785–786: 416
 13.789: 417 n. 28
 13.789–837: 424
 13.789: 417 n. 10
 13.791: 420
 13.810: 418
 13.820: 423
 13.821–830: 423
 13.824: 419
 13.842–850: 417
 13.857: 421
 13.858: 422
 13.868–869: 421
 13.876–877: 424 n. 45
 13.882–883: 421
 13.882–884: 422
 13.883: 418
 13.887: 422
 13.890: 422
 13.890–894: 409
 14.2–3: 424
 14.158–220: 424

- 14.514–526: 407 n. 8
 14.871: 424 n. 44
 15.1–81: 100 n. 55
 15.408: 300 n. 60
Tr. 2.259: 417
 4.2.51: 313 n. 42
- Parthenius
Amat. narr. 29: 504 n. 15
- Pausanias
 9.29.6: 14
- Philitas
 fr. 6 Spanoudakis = 11 Sbardella:
 14
 fr. 25 Sp. = 11 Sb.: 502
- Philostratus, Flavius
VA 4.5: 511 n. 38
- Philostratus the Younger
Imag. 2.4: 539 n. 80
- Philoxenus
PMG 815–824: 213
 816: 20, 105 n. 74
 819: 20, 105 n. 74
 820: 105 n. 74
 821: 21
 822: 76 n. 6
- Photius
Lex. λ 362 & 363 Theodoridis: 56
 n. 10
- Pindar
 fr. 70b.9 Maehler: 524 n. 27
- Plato
Cri. 47c–d: 226 n. 55
Ion 540c: 14
Gorg. 484e–486d: 19
 485e: 18
Leg. 677a–680e: 7
 700d–701b: 20 n. 43
 761d: 160 n. 36
- Lysis* 204d: 49 n. 84
 [*Minos*] 318a: 6
 321b–c: 6
Phaedr. 216a: 23
 227a–228e: 372, 397 n. 66
 229a–230c: 372, 397 n. 66
 230b–c: 438
Pol. 261d–262a: 6 n. 14
 263e–268c: 6 n. 14
 268b: 14
 275a–276e: 6 n. 14
 275b: 6
 276e: 6
 1256a: 7
Resp. 336d: 69
 343b–c: 6
 440d: 6
Symp. 179e–180a: 231 n. 68
 201b4–10: 49 n. 84
 201c: 48 n. 77
 217e: 25 n. 1, 27 n. 5
Theaet. 174d–e: 6
- Pliny the Elder
NH 16.51: 278 n. 6
 17.89: 277 n. 5
 19.89: 463
 19.89–91: 288
- Pliny the Younger
Ep. 5.3.5: 317 n. 55
- Plutarch
Ant. 33.3: 226 n. 56
Cato Maj. 7: 509 n. 27
Dem. 2–3: 509
Luc. 39.5: 509 n. 27
Alex. fort. 329a–c: 8
Quaest. Plat. 1010d: 509
Quaest. conv. 726e–727a: 509
- Pollux
Onom. 4.54 Bethe: 56 n. 10
- Pomponius
Chorogr. 1.72–75: 442

Posidippus

- 19.6–8 Austin-Bastianini: 107
- n. 81
- 63.9–10 A.–B.: 95
- 87 A.–B.: 110

Pratinas

- TrGF* 1: 518 n. 12

Proclus

- Σ Plato, *Parm.* p. 645.24–27
- Cousin: 204 n. 173

Prodromus, Theodorus: *Rhodanthe and Dosicles*

- 2.141–149: 556
- 3.47–78: 566 n. 60
- 4.329–330: 552
- 4.331–411: 552
- 4.344–356: 553
- 4.355–368: 555
- 4.361–362: 556, 557
- 4.363–364: 553
- 4.381–396: 556
- 4.389–392: 556
- 4.397–411: 553, 556
- 5.16–22: 570 n. 71
- 6.52–54: 570 n. 71

Propertius

- 1.1.5: 227 n. 59
- 2.1.43–44: 381 n. 29
- 2.10.16: 14 n. 26
- 2.17: 453
- 2.19: 453
- 3.1.1–6: 444
- 3.3: 273 n. 33
- 3.3.27–30: 444
- 3.3.52: 23 n. 47
- 3.16.13–14: 199
- 3.17: 273 n. 33
- 4.2.59: 462

Quintilian

- Inst.* 2.4.26: 163
- 10.1.92: 313

Sappho

- fr. 1.21–24 Voigt: 47 n. 76
- fr. 2: 496
- fr. 5: 37
- fr. 31.5–6: 495
- fr. 31.14–15: 495
- fr. 94.7–8: 38
- fr. 94.21–22: 38
- fr. 81.4–5: 39 n. 46
- fr. 102: 51, 52
- fr. 130: 495
- fr. 185: 51 n. 89

Seneca the Elder

- Suas.* 1.2: 418
- 3.7: 388 n. 47

Seneca the Younger

- Apocol.* 4.1.9: 454
- Cons. Polyb.* 8.2: 510
- 10.5: 510
- Ep.* 41.2: 446
- 41.3: 447, 448
- 41.4: 447
- 41.5: 447
- 41.6: 446
- Herc. fur.* 662–725: 428
- 686: 429
- 689–690: 429
- 698–706: 429
- 709–710: 429
- 716–720: 429
- Oed.* 37–43: 433
- 49–51: 433
- 530–536: 430
- 542–547: 430, 431, 432
- 563: 433
- 574–581: 433
- 582–585: 434
- 648–553: 435
- Phaedra* 508–517: 439
- Thyestes* 46: 438

Servius/Servius auctus

- praef.* to Virgil's *Buc.* comm.,
- p. 2.14–19 Thilo: 304
- p. 2.20: 304

- p. 3.4-5: 304
 p. 4-5: 249
ad Ecl. 1.1: 253 n. 44
 2.1: 253 n. 45, 303 n. 7
 3.1: 121 n. 4
 3.20: 304 n. 12
 3.88: 311 n. 36
 4.1: 311 n. 36
 4.18: 330
 5.1: 327
 5.20: 326 n. 85
 5.45: 327 n. 89
 5.81: 327 n. 89
 6.13: 15
 8.6: 311 n. 35
 9.1: 253 n. 45
 10.17: 304
 10.71: 304
 10.77: 304
 10.46: 362 n. 96
ad G. 4.564: 310 n. 34
- Simonides
IEG 20.5: 42 n. 61
 22: 42
 22.11-12: 42 n. 61
- Simonides
PMG 509: 100 n. 53
- Solon
IEG 4.32: 6
- Sophocles
TrGF 684: 219 n. 34
- Sophron
PCG 42-44: 212 n. 17
- Sositheus
TrGF 99F1a: 213 n. 18
 99F1a-3: 56 n. 11
- Statius
Silv. 1.2.268-270: 329 n. 102
 1.2.276: 456
 4.1: 329 n. 100
- Stesichorus (junior?)
PMGF 279: 2 n. 3, 186 n. 85
PMGF 279-280: 213 n. 18
- Strabo
 1.1.10: 23 n. 48
 1.2.3: 23 n. 48
 4.2.2: 508 n. 24
 10.469: 524 n. 27
- Suda*
 α 3867 Adler: 510
 ϑ 166: 209 n. 1, 211
 ζ 1951: 540 n. 83
 λ 626: 56 n. 10
 μ 194: 551 n. 14
 μ 1278: 210
 φ 332: 95 n. 27
- Suetonius
Vit. Verg. § 43: 451
- Synesius
Ep. 121: 21, 22 n. 46, 82 n. 25
- Tacitus
Dial. 21.7: 311 n. 36, 317 n. 55
- Theocritus
AP 9.433 = *HE* 3492ff.: 519, 520
 15.21 (*Syrinx*): 502
Id. 1.1: 263, 572
 1.1-2: 40 n. 51, 194
 1.1-3: 150, 331 n. 106
 1.1-6: 75
 1.1-8: 191, 202
 1.2: 202, 372 n. 9
 1.3: 197
 1.5: 42 n. 58, 573
 1.7: 75, 263, 575
 1.8-9: 197
 1.14: 34, 380, 485
 1.15-16: 488
 1.18: 34, 485
 1.19-20: 29, 30, 132, 242 n. 18
 1.21-23: 149, 152
 1.22-23: 573 n. 83

- 1.23-24: 237, 238, 241 n. 18
 1.23-28: 54
 1.24: 30 n. 15, 132
 1.25: 572, 575
 1.25-27: 34
 1.27: 572
 1.29-31: 524
 1.32-38: 191
 1.33: 373
 1.41: 19 n. 37
 1.44-54: 133, 191
 1.46-54: 573
 1.47: 373
 1.52-54: 574 n. 84
 1.55-56: 197
 1.56: 552, 573
 1.57-58: 145
 1.60-61: 54
 1.61: 30, 31
 1.65: 31
 1.71-75: 135 n. 49, 196
 1.76: 247
 1.76-79: 21
 1.80-81: 22
 1.86-87: 192
 1.86-91: 247
 1.93: 483
 1.95-97: 563
 1.97-98: 43 n. 62
 1.98: 483, 532
 1.98-99: 62
 1.99-102: 62
 1.100-101: 532
 1.103: 532
 1.105-106: 131, 244
 1.109-110: 131, 221
 1.115-136: 31
 1.116-117: 264
 1.120: 31 n. 17
 1.120-121: 264
 1.127: 534
 1.128-130: 164, 535
 1.130: 561
 1.131: 534
 1.132-133: 196 n. 128
 1.132-136: 15, 327, 561
 1.137: 534
 1.140: 42 n. 58, 132
 1.142: 534
 1.143-144: 55, 145
 1.144-145: 31, 533
 1.146: 184
 1.146-148: 197
 1.149: 573
 1.151-152: 245
 2.20: 398 n. 68
 2.55-56: 566
 2.64: 534
 2.95: 214
 2.115: 94
 2.118-128: 34
 2.140-141: 214
 2.143: 560 n. 43
 2.159-161: 214
 3.1: 34
 3.1-2: 70
 3.1-3: 278 n. 7
 3.3-5: 324 n. 76, 379, 380, 381
 3.6: 71, 383 n. 35, 398 n. 68
 3.8-10: 185 n. 80
 3.10: 71
 3.12-13: 72
 3.13: 71
 3.14: 71
 3.15-17: 483
 3.17: 189 n. 97
 3.19: 70
 3.19-21: 72
 3.20: 571 n. 76
 3.24: 72
 3.34: 71
 3.37: 571 n. 76
 3.38: 278 n. 7
 3.40-51: 561 n. 49
 3.42: 529
 3.43-44: 71
 3.45-48: 72
 3.46-47: 71
 3.46-48: 131
 3.47: 30
 3.52: 34, 278, 571 n. 76
 3.53: 71, 278
 4.1-14: 100 n. 54
 4.8-9: 100

- 4.12-20: 197 n. 130
 4.29-32: 101, 102
 4.38: 383 n. 35
 4.38-40: 192
 4.38-43: 257
 4.46: 250
 4.62: 193
 5.1-10: 103
 5.3: 381
 5.21-22: 57
 5.31: 248
 5.31-32: 57
 5.31-34: 181
 5.31-62: 522
 5.32: 248
 5.34: 248
 5.41: 381 n. 30
 5.44: 241 n. 18
 5.45-59: 149
 5.45-49: 372 n. 9
 5.45-61: 181
 5.50-51: 143
 5.54: 326
 5.58: 249
 5.60: 57, 241 n. 18
 5.60-73: 183
 5.67-68: 57
 5.80-83: 318 n. 59
 5.80-135: 57
 5.87b: 181
 5.88-89: 392 n. 56
 5.93: 373
 5.116: 381 n. 30
 5.118-119: 257
 5.124-127: 329 n. 99
 5.141: 243
 5.142: 189
 5.142b-144: 189
 5.143: 189
 6.3: 185
 6.3-5: 58
 6.6-7: 391
 6.6-19: 391
 6.7: 22, 575
 6.9: 575
 6.17: 47 n. 76, 560
 6.18-19: 48, 49
 6.20: 35, 58
 6.21-40: 58, 391
 6.32-33: 34 nn. 26, 27
 6.36: 575
 6.36-38: 185 n. 80
 6.40: 48
 6.43: 326
 6.43-45: 519
 6.44: 196 n. 128
 6.45: 15
 6.46: 35, 58, 59
 6.120-121: 41
 6.503-554: 567
 7.1: 174
 7.1-2: 39 n. 50
 7.6-9: 14
 7.11-20: 501
 7.15-19: 486
 7.19: 203, 326 n. 88
 7.20: 143
 7.21: 273
 7.22: 373 n. 13
 7.24: 203
 7.24-26: 242
 7.28-31: 11
 7.30-31: 177
 7.36: 11, 241 n. 18
 7.36-72: 326 n. 88
 7.37: 28, 33
 7.37-41: 223
 7.39-41: 94
 7.40: 501
 7.42: 143
 7.43: 174, 203, 326 n. 88
 7.43-48: 61
 7.44: 13, 283
 7.45: 204 n. 171
 7.47-48: 205
 7.49: 30, 241 n. 18, 307, 488
 n. 25
 7.50: 28, 273
 7.50-51: 39, 61
 7.51: 33, 164, 397 n. 66, 497
 7.51-58: 307
 7.52-89: 61
 7.57: 265
 7.61-62: 36

- 7.63–89: 64
 7.64: 38
 7.66: 246
 7.67–68: 38
 7.69: 38
 7.71–73: 133
 7.72–77: 213
 7.72–82: 252
 7.73–77: 327 n. 88
 7.73–85: 196
 7.78–85: 252
 7.78–89: 64
 7.83–89: 65
 7.86–89: 133
 7.87: 488 n. 25
 7.88–89: 264, 288, 307
 7.89: 202
 7.91–93: 487, 488
 7.91–95: 33, 61, 177
 7.92: 22, 134, 283, 284, 285,
 487, 532
 7.93: 301 n. 3
 7.96: 273
 7.96–127: 61
 7.115–119: 40, 41
 7.118: 42
 7.120: 41 n. 57
 7.121: 41 n. 57, 42
 7.121–125: 42
 7.125: 43
 7.126: 22, 244
 7.126–127: 483
 7.128: 143, 174, 203, 326 n. 88
 7.128–129: 326, 502
 7.128–157: 94
 7.129: 144
 7.129–130: 66
 7.131–157: 66
 7.132: 326 n. 88
 7.132–133: 398 n. 68
 7.132–134: 143
 7.132–146: 372 n. 9
 7.133: 194 n. 117
 7.135–136: 143
 7.135–146: 373 n. 13
 7.136: 372 n. 9
 7.136–137: 150
 7.138: 143
 7.139–142: 143
 7.143–144: 143
 7.144: 144
 7.144–145: 30
 7.147–155: 14
 7.149: 143
 7.151–155: 326 n. 88
 7.152: 418
 7. 155–157: 136
 7.156–157: 143
 [8].1: 184, 187 n. 89, 488 n. 25
 [8].2: 184, 187 n. 89, 488 n. 25
 [8].3: 184, 185, 283
 [8].4: 283
 [8].5–10: 59
 [8].6–13: 311
 [8].9: 255 n. 49
 [8].14: 255. n. 49
 [8].25–27: 183
 [8].28: 283
 [8].30: 60
 [8].33–40: 179, 183, 196
 [8].33–60: 60, 178
 [8].35: 255 n. 49
 [8].37–38: 197 n. 133
 [8].41–42: 185 n. 81
 [8].41–47: 197 n. 130
 [8].41–48: 183, 329 n. 99
 [8].43: 193
 [8].44: 193
 [8].47: 193
 [8].48: 193
 [8].49–52: 193
 [8].55–56: 182 and n. 68, 203,
 244, 374 n. 15
 [8].56: 183
 [8].57–60: 193
 [8].61–62: 60
 [8].63–70: 60, 203
 [8].64: 185
 [8].67: 255 n. 49
 [8].69–70: 185
 [8].72–75: 193
 [8].72–80: 60
 [8].76: 193
 [8].76–78: 202

- [8].78: 194
 [8].81: 283
 [8].84: 60
 [8].85–86: 60
 [8].86: 283
 [8].88–91: 189
 [8].92: 471 n. 21
 [8].92–93: 216
 [8].147: 66
 [9].3: 183
 [9].7–8: 181, 183, 202, 289
 n. 33
 [9].9–11: 181
 [9].13: 195
 [9].14: 174
 [9].16–17: 182
 [9].17–18: 183
 [9].18: 182
 [9].22–23: 174
 [9].22–27: 203
 [9].24: 204
 [9].29: 174
 [9].35–36: 78, 199
 10.18: 32
 10.22: 31
 10.22–23: 55, 56
 10.23: 31
 10.24–25: 31
 10.24–37: 50, 51, 256
 10.26–29: 507
 10.32–35: 182
 10.37: 32
 10.38–39: 56
 10.39: 256
 10.39–40: 32
 10.42–55: 256
 10.56–58: 32
 11.1–2: 80
 11.1–3: 85, 86, 192, 482
 11.1–4: 523 n. 25
 11.1–6: 75, 76
 11.3–4: 85, 87
 11.5: 85, 88
 11.7: 85, 105
 11.9: 575
 11.10–11: 259
 11.13: 192, 575
 11.17: 85
 11.17–18: 182 n. 68, 560
 11.18: 575
 11.19–20: 250
 11.22–23: 182
 11.26–27: 230
 11.31: 575
 11.31–34: 185 n. 80
 11.34–41: 523
 11.35: 419, 575
 11.35–37: 398 n. 68
 11.38: 230
 11.39: 192
 11.40: 462
 11.42–48: 182
 11.44: 398
 11.45–47: 423
 11.50: 575
 11.53: 198
 11.54: 232
 11.61: 127
 11.65: 192, 575
 11.72: 191
 11.75: 560, 575
 11.76: 401
 11.77–78: 567
 11.80: 192
 11.80–81: 85, 88, 483
 11.81: 260
 12.3–9: 569
 12.9–10: 489 n. 27
 13.1–2: 86
 13.3: 48
 14.12–43: 67, 68, 69, 70
 14.12–56: 108
 14.51: 566
 14.59: 109
 14.62: 109
 14.63: 109
 15.1–43: 121
 15.11: 135
 15.16: 130
 15.19–20: 130
 15.24–26: 138
 15.27–28: 141
 15.27–32: 123
 15.28–32: 144

- 15.30-31: 141
 15.33: 141, 144
 15.34: 142
 15.34-38: 130
 15.43: 141
 15.44: 141, 144
 15.44-64: 121
 15.46-50: 141
 15.47-50: 111
 15.51-52: 111
 15.51-55: 141
 15.52: 144
 15.60-64: 139, 144
 15.65: 141
 15.65-77: 121
 15.69-70: 144
 15.69-71: 130
 15.73: 144
 15.77: 139 n. 61, 142
 15.78-83: 130
 15.78-149: 121
 15.81: 124
 15.83: 123, 126, 133, 140
 15.87-88: 122
 15.87-95: 216
 15.88: 138
 15.89-95: 122
 15.90: 138
 15.91-92: 139
 15.93: 139
 15.95: 139
 15.96-99: 122, 144
 15.98: 125, 132
 15.101: 125
 15.102: 125
 15.106-108: 136
 15.109-112: 112
 15.110-111: 135
 15.111: 142
 15.112: 135
 15.112-113: 125, 143
 15.113: 142
 15.113-114: 112
 15.115-116: 135
 15.116: 142
 15.118: 125, 142, 143
 15.118-119: 112
 15.122: 125
 15.123: 135
 15.124: 136
 15.124-125: 125
 15.125: 130, 136, 143
 15.126: 136
 15.126-127: 130
 15.128: 125, 136
 15.130: 136
 15.131: 136
 15.133: 132
 15.135: 136
 15.136-137: 137
 15.137-142: 137
 15.138: 124
 15.139-142: 125
 15.143-144: 126 n. 22
 15.143-149: 222
 15.145: 126
 15.145-146: 125, 140
 15.149: 126
 16.3-4: 114
 16.5-18: 113
 16.14-34: 113
 16.19: 184
 16.26-29: 99
 16.29: 116
 16.36: 184
 16.44: 40 n. 51, 113
 16.45-57: 113
 16.58-109: 113, 114
 16.88-99: 113
 16.90-97: 2, 3
 17.18-19: 114 n. 96
 17.34-37: 106, 107
 17.56-57: 115
 17.58-59: 95
 17.64-67: 95
 17.75-79: 230
 17.77-105: 96
 17.79-81: 115
 17.97-103: 269
 17.98-101: 115
 17.112-116: 116, 269
 17.135-137: 96
 18.40-49: 97
 [20].1: 202

- [20].10: 181
 [20].10b: 181
 [20].13: 46 n. 71
 [20].14: 226 n. 55
 [20].15-16: 176
 [20].18: 184
 [20].19: 185
 [20].19-32: 181
 [20].22-27: 185
 [20].28: 202
 [20].28-29: 230
 [20].30: 185
 [20].40: 533
 22.54-74: 100
 22.98-99: 26 n. 3
 [23].3-5: 231
 [23].19-20: 210 n. 10
 [23].20: 231
 [23].23: 231
 [23].24: 231
 [23].25-26: 233
 [23].41: 232 n. 70
 [23].47-48: 219, 233
 [23].56: 226 n. 55
 [23].59: 226 n. 55
 24.86-87: 327
 [27].3: 193
 [27].4: 232 n. 70
 [27].24-33: 193
 [27].35: 193
 [27].42-44: 185
 [27].43: 194
 [27].47: 185
 [27].49: 193
 [27].53: 226 n. 56
 [27].66-71: 193
 [27].67-71b: 175
 [27].72-73: 175
 [27].93: 194
 29.1-4: 25, 26, 27, 28
 29.26: 34
 29.39-40: 34 n. 28
 30.25: 529, 566
 Σ *Prolegom.*
 sect. Ba, p. 2 Wendel: 9, 239
 n. 15
 Ba, pp. 2-3: 9
 Ca, pp. 3-4: 152 n. 15
 D, pp. 4-5: 121 n. 4
 D, p. 5.2-6: 204 n. 175
 Σ *Anecd. Estense* III.1, p. 7: 9
 1-2, pp. 7-9: 9
 6, p. 11: 204 n. 175
 Σ *Arg. Id.* 1: 255
 Id. 3: 254, 271
 Id. 6(f): 20 n. 41
 Id. 9: 178 n. 51
 Id. 10: 256
 Id. 11(c): 22
 Σ *Id.* 1.56: 573 n. 83
 1.72: 247
 186-91: 247
 1.105-106: 245
 1.151: 246
 3.1: 254
 3.2: 251
 3.8-9: 176 n. 39, 255, 271
 3.25-26: 250
 4.38-39: 255
 4.46: 250
 5.14-16: 251
 5.34: 248
 5.43: 260
 5.43: 259, 260
 5.58: 249
 5.102-103: 250
 5.104: 249
 5.112: 260
 5.112-113: 258, 260
 5.119: 258
 5.121: 258, 260
 5.122: 258
 5.141-143: 243
 6.6: 254
 7.16: 246, 249
 7.21: 254
 7.26: 242
 7.26: 242
 7.45-46: 251
 7.66: 246
 [8].6: 187 n. 89
 [8].53-56: 178 n. 51, 244
 [8].65: 250
 [9].28-30: 176 n. 39

- [9].33–36: 199, 200
 10.1–3: 255
 10.38–40: 256 n. 54
 10.48–51: 246
 11.1–3: 21, 76 n. 6, 200 n. 150
 11.3–4: 200 n. 150
 11.10–11: 259, 260
 11.81: 260
- Tibullus
 1.5.25: 419
- Timaeus
FCrHist 566F 69: 105 n. 76
 566F 72: 105 n. 76
 566F 83: 53 n. 1, 213 n. 18
- Virgil
Aen. 1.164–166: 434
 1.375–376: 544
 1.382: 544
 3.657: 372 n. 10
 4.13–14: 296
 4.15–16: 296
 4.17: 297
 4.31: 297
 4.22: 297
 4.23: 297 n. 52
 4.63: 296
 6.86–94: 332
 6.270–272: 430
 6.274: 430
 6.283–285: 430
 6.286–289: 430
 6.296–297: 430
 6.637–706: 430
 7.22: 434 n. 23
 7.37–45: 317 n. 57
 7.41: 332
 7.44–45: 332
 7.46: 298 n. 53
 7.96–101: 468
 8.351–354: 447
 9.446–449: 332 n. 110
 10.205–206: 411 n. 17
Ecl. 1.1: 263, 364, 432
 1.1–2: 251 n. 37, 264
 1.1–5: 346 n. 51, 372 n. 11, 489
 1.1–10: 305, 306
 1.2: 276, 289, 359
 1.2–10: 320
 1.4: 432
 1.4–5: 506
 1.5: 383, 392, 490
 1.6: 263, 270, 376
 1.6–7: 290, 291
 1.9–10: 265
 1.10: 370 n. 4, 410
 1.12: 263
 1.18: 306
 1.20: 307
 1.21: 307
 1.23–24: 307
 1.28: 285
 1.30: 383
 1.30–31: 507
 1.36: 383, 386
 1.38–39: 265
 1.40–45: 359
 1.41: 307
 1.41–42: 315
 1.42: 306
 1.42–43: 306
 1.44: 307
 1.44–45: 284
 1.45: 285, 307, 315, 370
 1.46–48: 315
 1.46–58: 370, 371, 372, 373,
 374, 378
 1.51: 372 n. 10, 383, 390
 1.51–55: 413
 1.51–56: 307
 1.53–55: 373 n. 13
 1.56: 374 n. 15
 1.60–73: 457
 1.61: 291
 1.64–78: 398
 1.70–72: 267
 1.70–78: 265
 1.73: 325
 1.74: 352
 1.75–78: 264, 370 n. 5
 1.79: 412
 1.79–83: 398

- 1.82-83: 474
 1.88: 437
 1.90-92: 437
 1.155: 377
 2.8-13: 348
 2.14: 383, 386
 2.15-18: 507
 2.17: 286
 2.21: 419
 2.26: 187
 2.28-35: 472
 2.30: 463
 2.31-39: 502, 503, 504, 505
 2.34-37: 505 n. 16
 2.36-39: 505 n. 16
 2.45: 286
 2.52: 383, 398 n. 68
 2.53: 398 n. 68
 2.56: 471
 2.58-59: 507
 2.66-67: 400
 2.66-68: 348
 2.70-72: 400
 3.1: 404 n. 3
 3.1-2: 264 n. 7
 3.3-5: 380
 3.5-6: 16
 3.10-11: 507
 3.12: 461
 3.16-20: 16
 3.56-57: 289 n. 33
 3.64-65: 391, 392
 3.70: 286
 3.76-79: 350
 3.80-81: 383
 3.81: 386
 3.84: 458
 3.84-87: 316
 3.86: 298, 311 n. 36
 3.88: 298
 3.88-89: 329
 3.89: 298
 3.93: 286
 3.98: 286
 3.111: 286, 473
 4.1: 294 n. 48, 332
 4.1-3: 327, 328, 346
 4.4-7: 347
 4.5: 293 n. 48, 332
 4.5-12: 328
 4.6-7: 457
 4.7: 293
 4.8: 286
 4.18: 286
 4.19: 294 n. 49
 4.21-22: 328
 4.22: 328 n. 96
 4.23: 196 n. 129
 4.24: 328
 4.25: 299 n. 59, 329
 4.26-27: 294 n. 49, 317 n. 53
 4.32: 463
 4.32-37: 317 n. 53
 4.34-36: 331
 4.36: 328 n. 96
 4.37-45: 331
 4.40-41: 296 n. 51
 4.42-45: 328
 4.43-45: 298
 4.49: 294 n. 49, 328 n. 96
 4.53-59: 330
 4.60: 286, 296 n. 51, 298 n. 53
 4.62: 286, 296 n. 51
 4.65: 472
 4.70: 472
 4.82-146: 457
 4.84: 329 n. 99
 5.1-4: 474
 5.5: 285
 5.8: 326 n. 88
 5.10-11: 325 n. 82
 5.11: 325
 5.12: 380
 5.13-14: 316 n. 53
 5.13-15: 363
 5.15: 326 n. 88
 5.18: 326 n. 88
 5.19: 284, 286
 5.20: 291
 5.20-44: 350, 384
 5.24-28: 327
 5.26: 437 n. 31
 5.38-39: 327
 5.42-44: 361, 362

- 5.43: 291
 5.43-44: 264
 5.43-45: 316 n. 53
 5.45-46: 412, 413
 5.48: 284
 5.48-49: 187
 5.49: 284, 286
 5.51-52: 325
 5.52: 291
 5.54: 286
 5.54-55: 363
 5.56-57: 299
 5.56-80: 384, 385
 5.60: 327
 5.60-61: 376
 5.61: 326
 5.63-64: 291
 5.64: 325
 5.66-68: 326
 5.67-73: 326 n. 88
 5.78: 325
 5.85-87: 224, 271, 322, 326, 345
 5.86: 187, 383
 5.86-87: 284, 391
 5.88-90: 326
 6.1: 270, 320
 6.1-2: 273
 6.1-12: 272, 317, 318
 6.2-8: 320
 6.3-4a: 205 n. 178
 6.3-8: 364
 6.4: 502 n. 11
 6.4-5: 320
 6.5: 473
 6.6-8: 359
 6.7-8: 376
 6.8: 277, 289, 410
 6.9-12: 317 n. 53
 6.10: 224
 6.11-12: 320
 6.13-26: 502
 6.14: 286
 6.24: 286
 6.27-28: 287
 6.27-30: 507
 6.31-40: 291
 6.37: 299
 6.40: 294 n. 49
 6.44: 392
 6.64-73: 14
 6.67: 320
 6.68: 292
 6.69: 320, 473
 6.70-71: 15
 6.72: 320
 6.73: 320
 6.82-84: 287
 6.84-86: 399, 400
 6.85-86: 348, 474
 6.86: 475 n. 34
 6.786-787: 277
 6.791-794: 331
 7.1: 187, 474
 7.3-4: 511
 7.5-6: 475
 7.6: 174 n. 31
 7.12-13: 410 n. 17
 7.17: 379
 7.18-20: 349
 7.25: 313
 7.27: 463
 7.37-40: 349, 365, 392
 7.37-44: 350 n. 60
 7.40: 392 n. 57
 7.41-44: 349, 350
 7.45-48: 379
 7.45-52: 350
 7.53-56: 350, 382
 7.54: 398 n. 68
 7.57-60: 350
 7.69-70: 471
 7.67: 226
 7.79: 475
 7.119-121: 474
 8.1.1: 313 n. 42
 8.6-13: 311, 458
 8.8: 331
 8.16: 204 n. 172
 8.64-109: 383 n. 35
 8.21: 348
 8.25: 348
 8.45: 286
 8.49: 286
 8.50: 286

- 8.61: 348
 9.1: 321, 324 n. 76
 9.9: 364, 461
 9.10: 321
 9.21–22: 388
 9.22: 324
 9.23: 324
 9.23–25: 321, 365, 379, 380,
 387, 388, 389, 391
 9.26: 365
 9.26–29: 321, 389
 9.27–29: 364
 9.32: 325 n. 82
 9.35–36: 322
 9.37–38: 365
 9.37–43: 390
 9.38: 384 n. 39
 9.39–43: 323, 364
 9.44–45: 365, 384 n. 39
 9.46: 187
 9.46–50: 323, 324, 328 n. 95,
 384 and n. 39, 385, 389
 n. 50
 9.50: 325 n. 81, 398 n. 68
 9.51–52: 286
 9.52–54: 324 n. 76
 9.55: 323, 325, 399
 9.59: 324 n. 76
 9.64: 306 n. 20, 324 n. 76,
 399
 9.66: 286, 325 n. 82
 9.67: 323, 324
 10.4–6: 360
 10.6: 268 n. 19
 10.20: 187
 10.36–43: 187
 10.52–54: 362, 285 n. 21
 10.70–77: 345, 346
 10.71: 321 n. 68
 10.72: 321
 10.74: 278
 10.75: 278
 10.75–76: 277, 432
 10.75–77: 402, 474
 10.77: 278, 310, 352
G. 1.119–121: 280
 1.155–157: 280 n. 11
 2.47–59: 279
 2.198–199: 322
 2.109: 295 n. 50
 2.467–471: 437
 3.14–15: 411 n. 17
 3.41–42: 315
 3.46: 278
 3.46–48: 315, 316
 4.116–148: 505 n. 16
 4.563–564: 279 n. 10
 4.563–566: 270, 308
 4.565: 278
 [*Catal.*] 9.13–20: 209 n. 1
 9.13–22: 201 n. 158
 [*Dirae*] 7, 31, 45, 80–81, 91–94:
 452
 Xenophanes
 IEG 2.19: 6
 VS 21B15: 298 n. 53
 Xenophon
 Cyn. 5.16: 572 n. 80
 5.24: 572 n. 80
 Cyr. 1.1.2: 14
 8.2.14: 6
 Mem. 3.2.1: 6